Volume 45 ISSN 0042-6032

A review of early christian life and language

Vigiliae Christianae

editors-in-chief

J. den Boeft, Leiderdorp
R. van den Broek, Utrecht
A. F. J. Klijn, Groningen
G. Quispel, Utrecht
J. C. M. van Winden, Leiden

associate editors

M. Anastos, Los Angeles
A. Davids, Nijmegen
R. M. Grant, Chicago
Marguerite Harl, Paris
J.-P. Mahé, Paris
Elaine Pagels, Princeton
D. T. Runia, Amsterdam
R. Staats, Kiel

E. J. BRILL
Leiden

© *Copyright 1991 by E. J. Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands*

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or translated in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, microfiche or any other means without written permission from the publisher

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

I. ARTICLES

AUBINEAU, M., Citations de l'homélie de Proclus, *In nativitatem Salvatoris* (CPG 5068), dans un florilège christologique des IVe et Ve siècles 209
BREMMER, J., *see* DEN BOEFT
CARLETON PAGET, J. N. B., Barnabas 9:4: A Peculiar Verse on Circumcision 242
DE CONICK, A. D. and FOSSUM, J., Stripped before God: A New Interpretation of Logion 37 in the Gospel of Thomas 123
DEN BOEFT, J. and BREMMER, J., Notiunculae Martyrologicae IV 105
FEICHTINGER, B., Der Traum des Hieronymus — Ein Psychogramm 54
FOSSUM, J., *see* DE CONICK
FREDRIKSEN, P., Apocalypse and Redemption in Early Christianity 151
HALPORN, J. W., Literary History and Generic Expectations in the *Passio* and *Acta Perpetuae* 223
KINZIG, W., 'Non-Separation': Closeness and Co-operation between Jews and Christians in the Fourth Century 27
KINZIG, W., Asterius Sophista oder Asterius Anonymus? Eine Antwort 387
MAHÉ, J.-P., La voie d'immortalité à la lumière des *Hermetica* de Nag Hammadi et de découvertes plus récentes 347
MEIJERING, E. P., Struktur und Zusammenhang des apologetischen Werkes von Athanasius 313
PATTERSON, S. J., Sources, Redaction and *Tendenz* in the *Acts of Peter and the Twelve Apostles* (NH VI,1) 1
PETRUCCIONE, J., The Persecutor's Envy and the Rise of the Martyr Cult: *Peristephanon* Hymns 1 and 4 327
SCOTT, A., Origen's Use of Xenocrates of Ephesus 278
VAN KAMPEN, L., *Acta Andreae* and Gregory's *De Miraculis Andreae* 18
VAN OORT, J., The «Augustinus Lexikon» 376
WALSH, J. J., On Christian Atheism 255
WOODS, D., The Date of the Translation of the Relics of SS. Luke and Andrew to Constantinopel 286

II. REVIEWS

ALT, K., *Philosophie gegen Gnosis. Plotins Polemik in seiner Schrift II 9* (J. C. M. van Winden) 297
ARMSTRONG, A. H., *Hellenic and Christian Studies* (survey) 308
AUBINEAU, M., *Chrysostome, Sévérien, Proclus, Hésychius et alii: Patristique et Hagiographie grecques* (survey) 309
AZZALI BERNARDELLI, G., *Tertulliano, Scorpiace* (J. C. M. van Winden) 409
BABCOCK, W. S., *Paul and the Legacies of Paul* (survey) 308
BALTES, M., *see* DÖRRIE
BAMMEL, C. P., *see* HAMMOND

BLANC, C., *see* SCHATKIN
CAVARNOS, J. P., *see* HEIL
CLARKE, G., *Reading the Past in Late Antiquity* (survey) 102
CROUZEL, H., *Les fins dernières selon Origène* (survey) 309
DECKERS, J. G., SEELIGER, H. R., MIETKE, G., *Die Katakombe »Santi Marcellino e Pietro«, Repertorium der Malereien* (P. van Moorsel) 404
DÖRRIE, H., *Der Platonismus in der Antike, Band 2* (J. C. M. van Winden) 190
DOUTRELEAU, L., *see* PIÉDAGNEL
Figures de l'Ancien Testament chez les Pères (survey) 103
FISCHER, B., *Die lateinischen Evangelien bis zum 10. Jahrhundert. III. Varianten zu Lukas* (G. J. M. Bartelink) 93
GIANNARELLI, E., *S. Gregorio di Nissa, La vita di S. Macrina* (J. den Boeft) 191
GIRARDI, M., *Basilio di Cesarea e il culto dei martiri nel IV secolo. Scrittura e tradizione* (J. den Boeft) 415
GODDING, R., *Bibliografia di Gregorio Magno (1890/1989)* (G. J. M. Bartelink) 186
GRIGGS, C. W., *Early Egyptian Christianity from its origins to 451 CE* (G. Quispel) 205
GRILLET, B., *Homélie sur Babylas* (J. C. M. van Winden) 187
GUINOT, J.-N., *see* GRILLET
HAMMOND BAMMEL, C. P., *Der Römerbrieftext des Rufin und seine Origenes-Übersetzung* (G. J. M. Bartelink) 93
HEIL, G., *Gregorii Nysseni Sermones, pars II* (J. C. M. van Winden) 305
HEITHER, TH., *Origenes, Commentarii in Epistolam ad Romanos L. I et II/Römerbriefkommentar Buch 1 und 2* (J. C. M . van Winden) 293
KINZIG, W., *In Search of Asterius. Studies on the Authorship of the Homilies on the Psalms* (K.-H. Uthemann) 194
KURMANN, A., *Gregor von Nazianz, Oratio 4 gegen Julian. Ein Kommentar* (J. den Boeft) 89
LAGA, C. *et* STEEL, C., *Maximi Confessoris Quaestiones ad Thalassium II* (J. C. M. van Winden) 298
LAYTON, B., *Nag Hammadi Codex II, 2-7* (G. Quispel) 78
L'église et l'empire au IVe siècle (J. den Boeft) 102
LENDLE, O., *see* HEIL
MANDOUZE, A., *Prosopographie du Bas-Empire I, Prosopographie de l'Afrique chrétienne (303-535)* (J. van Oort) 302
MANN, F., *see* DÖRRIE AND HEIL
MANSFELD, J., *Studies in Later Greek Philosophy and Gnosticism* (survey) 101
MARAVAL, P., *Grégoire de Nysse, Lettres* (J. C. M. van Winden) 189
MARCOVICH, M., *Athenagoras, Legatio pro Christianis* (D. T. Runia) 398
MARCOVICH, M., *Pseudo-Justinus, Cohortatio ad Graecos, De monarchia, Oratio ad Graecos* (D. T. Runia) 398
MIETKE, G., *see* DECKERS
PIÉDAGNEL, A., *Jean Chrysostome, Trois catéchèses baptismales* (J. C. M. van Winden) 188
PILHOFER, P., *Presbyteron Kreitton. Der Altersbeweis der jüdischen und christlichen Apologeten und seine Vorgeschichte* (J. C. M. van Winden) 412
POST, P. G. J., *De haanscène in de vroeg-christelijke kunst: een iconografische en iconologische analyse* (P. C. J. van Dael) 96

Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum. Lieferungen 113-115 (J. C. M. van Winden) 306
Rees, B. R., *Pelagius. A Reluctant Heretic* (J. den Boeft) 87
Rizzi, M., *La questione dell' unità dell' »Ad Diognetum«* (G. J. M. Bartelink) ... 184
Rubenson, S., *The Letters of St. Antony. Origenist Theology, Monastic Tradition and the Making of a Saint* (G. J. M. Bartelink) 185
Runia, D. T., *Exegesis and Philosophy. Studies on Philo of Alexandria* (survey) 309
Schatkin, M. A., *Jean Chrysostome, Discours sur Babylas* (J. C. M. van Winden) 187
Schmitz, J., *Ambrosius, De Sacramentis/De Mysteriis. Über die Sakramente/Über die Mysterien* (J. C. M. van Winden) 294
Seeliger, H. R., *see* Deckers
Segal, A. F., *Paul the Convert. The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee* (G. Quispel) 203
Sgherri, G., *Origene, Sulla Pasqua. Il papyro di Tura* (G. J. M. Bartelink) 91
Speyer, W., *Frühes Christentum im antiken Strahlungsfeld* (J. den Boeft) 192
Steel, C., *see* Laga
Tevel, J. M., *De preken van Basilius van Seleucië* (J. C. M. van Winden) 306
Van Oort, J., *Jerusalem and Babylon. A study into Augustine's City of God and the sources of his doctrine of the Two Cities* (W. H. C. Frend) 298
Vetus Latina, 11/2 and 25 (G. J. M. Bartelink) 93
Visonà, G., *Pseudo Ippolito in sanctum Pascha* (G. J. M. Bartelink) 413
Books received 103, 208, 310

Vigiliae Christianae 45 (1991), 1-17, E. J. Brill, Leiden

SOURCES, REDACTION AND *TENDENZ* IN THE *ACTS OF PETER AND THE TWELVE APOSTLES* (NH VI, 1)

BY

STEPHEN J. PATTERSON

The *Acts of Peter and the Twelve Apostles* (*Acts Pet. 12 Apost.*) is the first tractate in Codex VI from Nag Hammadi. The issues of its date and provenance have yet to be settled, but a second or third century date in Syria seems likely.[1] Its original title is unknown, since the first four lines on page one, which would have contained the *incipit*, are too fragmentary to allow for a reliable reconstruction.[2] The title customarily used to refer to this text was added by a scribe at the end in subscript fashion. Its secondary character is suggested in the tension created by its use of the stereotypical "Twelve" apostles, while the text itself involves only eleven disciples (9.20-22).[3]

The theological character of the *Acts Pet. 12 Apost.* has been a matter of dispute. On the one hand, its presence in the Nag Hammadi collection has suggested to some that this text, if not clearly Gnostic, was certainly intended to be read from a Gnostic point of view.[4] But more recent work on the Nag Hammadi Library as a whole has shown that its unifying character is not provided by Gnosticism, as was thought initially, but the theoretical underpinning of ascetic practice;[5] thus, one can no longer simply assume that all of the Nag Hammadi tractates are Gnostic. The *Acts Pet. 12 Apost.* contains nothing that could be identified specifically as Gnostic,[6] but it does contain material that would be of interest to those engaged in the practice of asceticism (cf. 5.19-6.8; 7.23-8.6). This feature could quite readily account for its presence in the Nag Hammadi collection. However, the ascetic sections are by no means the focus of this text, and to characterize it as ascetic really brings us no closer to an adequate reading of the text than does the Gnostic hypothesis. The present essay attempts to arrive at a reading of the *Acts Pet. 12 Apost.* which, on the one hand, gives close attention to the often puzzling details in its narrative, and, on the other hand, considers the over-all structure of the text and the "story" it presents in its present form.

1. *The Narrative*

The text opens with the disciples embarking upon a ministry (ⲁⲓⲇⲓⲕⲟⲛⲓⲁ) to which the Lord (ⲡⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ) has appointed them (1.1-13). They travel by ship to an island city (1.14-29). When Peter inquires about the name of this city (1.30-33), one of the local inhabitants answers with something approximating (the text becomes fragmentary at this point) the following: "[The name] of this c[ity is Habition; that] is: ground [yourself in en]durance. And so [shall] your ruler, who is in (or among) you..." (2.2-6), and with that the enigmatic reply breaks off, leaving us with but a few scattered words.[7]

Having learned the mysterious name of this city, Peter sets out to find lodging (2.7-10). He encounters a pearl merchant, who reveals himself also to be a stranger in the city (2.10-3.11). As he calls out "Pearls! Pearls!" in the streets, both rich and poor hearken to his cries in turn. First the rich look out upon the man from their shops and homes, but seeing no pouch in which the pearls might be carried, they take him to be a fraud and turn away (3.11-31). The poor, however, come to the man and ask permission simply to see one of his pearls, that they might at least say to their friends: "We saw a pearl with our own eyes." The merchant shows them no pearl, but instead promises them that if they will only come to his city, he will give them a pearl free of charge (3.32-5.1).

Peter then turns to the pearl merchant and inquires both about his name, and about the difficulties to be encountered on the way to his city (5.5-14). The pearl merchant reveals his name to be Lithargoel (ⲗⲓⲫⲁⲣⲅⲟⲏⲗ), which is attested elsewhere in antiquity as the name of one of Gabriel's angelic princes in Jewish mythology.[8] As for the way to his city, Lithargoel tells Peter that it is fraught with dangers from bandits and beasts of various sorts. To arrive there safely it is necessary to leave behind all worldly goods, even food and water, for which the bandits and beasts would surely kill the helpless traveler (5.17-6.8). Armed with these instructions, Peter sets off to gather the disciples and prepare them for the journey, but not before he asks Lithargoel the name of the city. Lithargoel replies: "This is the name of my city: In nine gates let us praise God in the knowledge that the tenth is the head" (6.23-25). Peter and the disciples undertake the journey to this mysteriously named city, and following the instructions of Lithargoel, arrive safely outside its gates (7.19-8.11). As they pause there for a moment of rest and contemplation, Lithargoel appears to them, now

disguised as a physician. The physician startles them by addressing Peter by name, before Peter, or any of the disciples have introduced themselves. Thereupon the following exchange takes place between Lithargoel and Peter:

> Lithargoel answered, "I want to ask you who gave you the name Peter?" Peter said to him, "It was Jesus Christ, the son of the living God. He gave this name to me." He answered and said, "It is I! Recognize me, Peter." (9.8-14)

Thus, the physician reveals himself to the disciples (oddly, not as Lithargoel, but) as Jesus himself. This resurrection encounter is followed by a commissioning scene, in which the disciples are told to return to Habitation, and to give to the poor that which they need to survive, and to heal the sick, that even as they are healed of their physical ailments, they might also entrust to the disciples the healing of their hearts (9.22-11.26). At the same time, they are to avoid the rich, "lest their partiality influence you!" (12.3-4) The text ends as the disciples depart in peace with the customary "Amen."

2. *Problems of Literary Continuity*

Summarized in this way, the *Acts Pet. 12 Apost.* makes for an interesting and entertaining narrative, an imaginative myth of origins for the commissioning of apostles. But the careful reader of this text is confronted with a myriad of problems involving its literary continuity, or rather, lack thereof. Its narrative is replete with jolting aporias. It will suffice to rehearse just a few of the more problematic of these to illustrate the point.

In 5.1-6 the poor who have heard the promises of the pearl merchant, Lithargoel, turn to Peter and ask him about the hardships to be expected on the way to Lithargoel's city:

> The men asked Peter about the hardships. Peter answered and told those things that he had heard about the hardships of the way. (5.1-5)

There is something amiss here. First, Peter has never been to Lithargoel's city, and has not yet even learned its name. In terms of the narrative presented thus far, he knows nothing about it. How, then, is he able to tell the poor about the hardships to be encountered in travelling there? The real narrative jolt, however, comes two lines later, when Peter, having already instructed the poor, now turns to Lithargoel himself:

> He said to the man who sells the pearl, "I want to know your name and the hardships of the way to your city because we are strangers and servants of God." (5.7-12)

Thereupon follows Lithargoel's account of the dangers to be encountered and the precautions needed to avoid them (5.19-6.8). 5.1-5 clearly presupposes this or some similar scene; the author has "placed the cart before the horse," so to speak.

Lithargoel's account of the dangers itself poses a narrative problem. The text reads as follows:

> And also the road to that city, which you asked me about, I will tell you about it. No one is able to go on that road, except one who has forsaken everything and has fasted daily from one watch to the next. For many are the robbers and wild beasts on that road. The one who takes along bread the black dogs kill because of the bread. The one who takes along a costly garment of the world the robbers kill [because of the] garment. [The one who carries along] water [the wolves kill because of the water,] since they are thirsty [for] it. [The one who] is anxious about [meat] and green vegetables, the lions eat because of the meat. If one evades the lions, that one the bulls devour because of the green vegetables. (5.19-6.8)

Now there is nothing wrong with these instructions, except, as Schenke points out, they seem to ignore the fact that its setting is an *island* city: "Auf See gibt es keine schwärzen Hunde, Wölfe, Löwen und Stiere."[9]

In 8.11-9.19 one finds the account of the resurrection appearance. The narrative problem here is perhaps more subtle, but clear nonetheless. At the very beginning of this narrative the mysterious physician is identified by the narrator as Lithargoel, even though this identity is hidden to Peter and the disciples. And throughout the narrative he is referred to as Lithargoel, lest the reader forget who he really is. Yet, as Parrott has noted, the surprise, and the aporia occurs when the physician finally does reveal his true identity—not as Lithargoel, as one expects, but as "Jesus Christ, the Son of the Living God." The naming of the figure as Lithargoel, and the consequent identification of Lithargoel with Jesus, ties this episode to those which precede it; however, in terms of this appearance narrative itself, the identification of the figure with Lithargoel is clearly superfluous.[10]

The narrative which continues in 8.20ff. also presents one with noteworthy problems. For example, the dialogue between Peter and the Physician begins: "Peter *responded* (ⲟⲩⲣⲱⲟⲩⲃ̄)and said..." Yet in the narrative as we have it, Peter has not yet been asked a question; in fact, the physician has not yet spoken at all! Similarly, in the final scene, in

which the disciples are commissioned to serve the poor, to Peter's objection that he and the disciples do not have the wherewithal to care for the poor, the Lord replies: "O Peter, it was necessary for you to understand the parable (ⲡⲓⲙⲁⲣⲁⲃⲟⲗⲏ) that I told you!" (10.23-25) But this text contains no parables.

To these aporias in the plot of the story many others might be added.[11] However, in the interest of brevity, it may prove expedient to move to a particular set of aporias which is very important for the analysis that follows, viz. those which result from a number of peculiar shifts in the text's narrative voice.

The text opens with a narrative spoken in the first person plural. In 1.30, however, this "We" narrative gives way suddenly to a first person singular narrative spoken by Peter. This "I, Peter" narrative voice continues to 3.11, where a narrative in the third person begins. However, this situation is short lived. By the middle of the page six (6.9) the author has returned to a Petrine perspective, with the narrative continuing in the first person singular voice. In 7.23 there is yet another shift, this time from the first person singular back to the first person plural. Finally, as the text moves from the resurrection appearance to the commissioning scene there is yet another shift in narrative voice. Until 9.29 the "We" voice prevails, presenting the resurrection as an eye-witness account—typical for this genre. But at line 30 there is an abrupt shift back once again to the third person.

3. *Literary and Source Theories*

Various theses have been offered which might account for these odd narrative shifts. Vernon Robbins, for example, has suggested that they might be accounted for simply on stylistic grounds.[12] Robbins took note of this narrative problem in the *Acts Pet. 12 Apost.* in his treatment of the similar problem posed by the so-called "we passages" in the canonical Acts of the Apostles. In a well-documented study of ancient narrative accounts of various sorts, Robbins is able to show that it is a common convention among ancient narrators to shift from a first person singular, or third person voice into the first person plural when telling of a sea voyage. For example, for the most part Homer narrates the Odyssey from the point of view of Odysseus, in the first person singular. Yet time and again, precisely at a point in the narrative where a sea voyage is begun, the narrative voice shifts to the plural, often using

the set formula: "From there *we* sailed on..." Robbins suggests that the reason for this shift is essentially sociological: "on a sea voyage a person has accepted a setting with other people, and cooperation among all the members is essential for the successful voyage. Therefore, at the point where the voyage begins, the narration moves to the first person plural."[13] Robbins argues that it is this common literary convention which best explains the mysterious we-passages in Acts, not a source deriving from an eye witness to the expeditions of Paul.

In his survey of the literature, Robbins suggests that the narrative shifts in the *Acts Pet. 12 Apost.* might also be accounted for by this literary convention.[14] There may be something to this suggestion. It is noteworthy, for example, that the shift from the first person plural to the first person singular voice of Peter at 1.29-30 corresponds to the narrative moment in the story in which a sea voyage comes to an end, and a land-based episode begins. Similarly, at 9.17-26 there is a shift from the first person singular back to the first person plural at the point where Peter and the disciples undertake the journey to Lithargoel's city (although this is not narrated as a sea journey).

However, this literary phenomenon clearly cannot explain all of the narrative problems in this text. For, in contrast to the we-passages in Acts, the narrative shifts in the *Acts Pet. 12 Apost.* often involve not simply a shift in voice (third person to first, or singular to plural), but an actual shift in the narrative perspective of the text. For example, in the episode of Peter's encounter with Lithargoel (1.30-3.11) the voice is clearly that of Peter narrating the story in the first person singular. But in the next episode (the account of Lithargoel selling pearls in the city: 3.11-5.5), which is narrated in the third person, it is clear that the voice of the narrator cannot be identified with Peter, since Peter is referred to impersonally as a character in this story (5.3). In other words, the difference between these two episodes is not simply a shift from one voice to another (first person to third), but a shift in the *identity* of the narrating voice as well (from Peter to some non-Petrine voice). This identity shifts again when, midway into the next episode (Peter learns of the way to Lithargoel's city and its name: 5.5-6.27), there is a shift back to the first person singular (6.9), which again must no doubt be identified with the voice of Peter.[15] And the identity of the voice shifts twice more before the end of the text. The episode in which Lithargoel reveals himself to the disciples (8.10-9.29) is told in a first person plural voice; however, unlike the first person plural voice heard in 7.26; 8.4,6 and 11,

this voice cannot be identified with Peter, for Peter is mentioned frequently as a character in the narrative (e.g., 8.29; 9.1-5). The voice is that of one in the apostolic group, but not Peter. A final shift is to be observed with the transition to the last episode in the story (the commissioning: 9.30-12.29). There is at 9.30 a distinct shift from the first person plural to the third person; however, again it is more than a shift in voice. The identity of the voice, which in the previous episode was that of the disciples, and in earlier episodes was that of Peter, can here be neither! For the disciples are referred to impersonality as a group from 9.30 on, and Peter is referred to specifically in 10.12, 21 and 11.1.

It is also noteworthy that, aside from the two instances mentioned above, the shifts in narrative voice in the *Acts Pet. 12 Apost.* do not coincide with a transition from land to sea, or from local action to travel. Perhaps the most obvious instance to point to in this connection is the shift from first to third person voice at 9.30. Here there is no corresponding shift in location at all. In another instance there is a shift in the narrative from travel to local action, but no corresponding shift out of the first person plural voice, which was used to narrate the travel (8.4, 8, 11, 12, etc.). Thus, while Robbins' theory may help to explain the phenomenon of the we-passages in the canonical Acts, and even a few of the shifts in voice in the *Acts Pet. 12 Apost.*, something more is needed to explain all of the odd transitions one finds in this curious text.

A second kind of hypothesis might be offered to help explain its problems, viz. the possibility that the *Acts Pet. 12 Apost.* was not originally composed out of whole cloth, but represents the efforts of a redactor working with sources. Indeed, two slightly different source hypotheses have been proposed already by Krause and Parrott. Both share the notion that the present *Acts Pet. 12 Apost.* is composed of two originally separate acts, a Petrine act and an apostolic act, which have simply been joined together consecutively to form a single narrative. Krause attempts to identify these two original texts on the basis of content. Thus, 1.27-7.23 is taken to be the Petrine source, since here most of the action involves only Peter. The apostles first begin to play a significant role in 8.13; thus, his second source is composed of 8.13-12.19.[16] Parrott, on the other hand, takes as his point of departure the aporia at the beginning of page 5, where Peter tells the poor about the dangers that await them on the road to Lithargoel's city, and then turns himself to Lithargoel to learn from him what dangers await. Parrott

divides the text precisely here, the Petrine text breaking off with Peter's answer to the poor, the apostolic text beginning with Peter's question to Lithargoel (5.5).[17]

While both of these theories would explain a few of the narrative problems posed by this text, neither solves them all, or even the most difficult. Neither is complex enough to deal with its most puzzling aspect, viz. the fact that the narrative voice shifts from first person to third, now back again to the first person, first singular, now plural, and now back again to the third person, etc., etc. No theory which poses two sources simply joined together consecutively can account for these multiple shifts from one voice to another, and then back again.

Schenke's approach to the text represents a more fruitful attempt to deal with this complex problem. Though his is not a source theory *per se*, he does propose a series of compositional layers in this text. The basic narrative is composed roughly of 1.7-7.18, a story about Peter's journey to an island city, how he learns its name, and from a mysterious stranger, the name of yet another more distant city. The point of this narrative is to be found in Peter's discussions with various other characters over the highly symbolic names of these two cities.[18] As Schenke has shown with parallels drawn from contemporary literature, the names of the two cities are intentionally allegorical.[19] The city called "Habitation" represents the world, in which Christians must dwell and endure until they attain to the heavenly city. This heavenly abode is the second city named in our text. With its ten gates, its intended referent is no doubt the heavenly Jerusalem with its celestial temple.[20]

The second compositional level is not tacked onto the end of this story, but rather inserted into it. This is the story of Lithargoel, the pearl merchant (roughly 2.10-6.19). It would have included, in Schenke's estimation, both the story of Lithargoel's dealings with the rich and the poor, and the instructions on how to arrive at his city, given originally directly to the poor without Peter's involvement at all.[21]

A third level can be recognized, according to Schenke, in roughly the text 8.11-end, a resurrection appearance in which the disciples are commissioned to serve the poor.[22]

Schenke's theory of multiple levels of composition, with one level superimposed onto, or into an initial level, with yet another level attached to the end may offer the basis for a solution to the problem. Yet, as constituted, Schenke's theory still leaves unexplained several problems in the text. For example, the aporia at the beginning of page

five would not be accounted for in such a scheme, as it lies in the middle of Schenke's level II. Nor would the shift from first to third person at 9.29 be explained, since it lies in the middle of his level III.

4. *Methodological Observations*

While the present proposal for solving the problem of this text's compositional history differs somewhat from all of the solutions discussed above, it rests upon lessons learned from each of these earlier attempts:

1) Robbins' study has shown that not every shift in the narrative voice of a text need necessarily be traced to the use of disparate sources or redactional layering. Thus, for example, there is no real need to explain the shift from the first person plural voice at the beginning of the text to the first person singular at 1.30. This sort of transition falls well within the conventions of style for ancient writers, the plural voice being more appropriate for narrating the sea voyage with which the *Acts Pet. 12 Apost.* opens.

2) However, as I have argued above, this still leaves a number of aporias in the narrative of this text unaccounted for. It is these unexplained shifts in narrative voice which raise the question of possible sources or compositional levels in the text in the first place; therefore, any compositional theory must be able to account for them. The use of these narrative aporias to identify different sources in the *Acts Pet. 12 Apost.* was stressed in Parrott's study; the following proposal depends heavily upon this procedure as well.

3) However, the aporias alone will not always provide one with the neat divisions in the text one would hope for in trying to clarify where one voice stops and another voice begins. Only once may a narrative aporia be said actually to mark the seam between two sources or layers, viz. the abrupt shift from first to third person at 9.30. Elsewhere the scribe seems to have been relatively skilled in smoothing over the seams between sources. For example, it is clear that somewhere between 3.7 and 5.3 there has been a shift from the first person voice of Peter to the third person voice of an anonymous narrator. But where has the shift actually taken place? The seam is difficult to identify. At 3.11 there is a shift from first to third person, but the third person narrative is placed ostensibly on the lips of Peter, who tells the story of Lithargoel now as an observer of events, not as a participant in them. Narratively this poses no problem. Only at 5.3, when one encounters Peter among those

being observed does one realize that there is a problem, and that the identity of the voice has changed. It is as though a redactor was able to accomplish a smooth transition from one source to another, but once he/she was well into the second source the identity of the voice in the original narrative was soon forgotten as the scribe dutifully copied exactly what was on the page before him/her. By 5.3 the redactor has simply forgotten that it is Peter who is telling the story. The same might be said of the transition from the third to first person perspective somewhere between 5.7 and 6.9, and the shift from the first person voice of Peter in 7.17 to the non-Petrine first person voice which appears unequivocally first in 8.21. In a sense, these aporias tell one that a shift in narrative voice has occurred, but they do not always tell one exactly *where* the shift has occurred, and consequently, where the redactor left one source and began using another. For this reason, it may be necessary to pay attention, not only to the aporias in the text, and the various places at which new voices emerge, but also the episodic structure of the text as a whole. When there is a correspondence between shifts in narrative voice and the text's movement from one episode to the next, there one may perhaps identify the joining of episodes from various sources to form the single narrative we have before us. This was Krause's starting point, and it was not without value.

4) Any theory explaining the compositional history of this text must be complex enough to deal with the complexity of the problem created by the multiplicity of disparate voices heard within it. There are at least three different voices to be identified here: the I, Peter voice, which predominates until about the middle of page 8; the first person plural voice of the disciples, which emerges clearly on page 9; and an anonymous third person voice, which emerges briefly at the beginning of page 5, but begins to dominate only at 9.30, continuing from there to the end of the document. Thus, a minimum of three sources is required to account for the presence of all three voices adequately. Furthermore, the fact that the third person voice emerges at least twice in the narrative, the first time only to be replaced once again by the first person voice of Peter, means that one should not be limited to imagining three texts which have simply been strung together one after another. The solution, rather, will look something like that proposed by Schenke, with one text forming the basic structure of the text, a second being superimposed upon, or transposed into the midst of this first text, and another or other texts being affixed perhaps to the end.

5. *A Three-Source Hypothesis*

With these principle observations in mind, then, the following thesis regarding the composition of the *Acts Pet. 12 Apost.* might be proposed. The text is the product of combining and adapting episodes from three distinct original sources.

1) The first source might be called the "I, Peter Source," since it is characterized by the narrative voice of Peter in the first person. It consists of 1.1-3.11 and 5.5-8.9. Originally it would have been the story of Peter's encounter with the angel Lithargoel. The encounter takes place in the city called Habitation, whose symbolic name signifies it as the earthly abode. From Lithargoel Peter also learns of another city, whose name identifies it as the heavenly Jerusalem, and receives instructions for how to arrive there safely, viz. the ascetic instructions in 5.19-6.8. The point of this narrative would have been the discussions between Peter and the other characters over the nature of the two cities, the ascetic requirements for arriving safely in the heavenly abode, and finally the depiction of Peter and the disciples as they arrive at the heavenly city, prepared to take in the beatific vision that awaits them there.

This first source might be likened to later texts, such as the Book of the Enthronement of the Archangel Michael, in which the ascent of the disciples is described, as they are led by Michael and the Savior through the successive heavenly gates, and ultimately into the presence of God, from whom they then receive their blessing.[23] Lithargoel, who appears to the disciples as one of five angelic princes in the Book of the Enthronement of the Archangel Gabriel is well suited to the role of heavenly guide.[24]

2) The second source might be called simply the "Third Person Source," since it is characterized by its third person narrative voice. From this source the redactor has drawn two episodes: the story of the pearl merchant (3.11-5.5), which has been inserted into the I, Peter text, and the commissioning of the disciples (9.30-12.29), which forms the final scene in the *Acts Pet. 12 Apost.* The commissioning scene is clearly from a distinct source. Not only is there an episodic shift here from resurrection appearance to commissioning, but the abrupt shift into the third person voice clearly distinguishes it from the first person narrative which precedes it as well. The story of the pearl merchant is less clearly from a distinct source. The shift to the third person at 3.11 is, after all, hardly problematic, for the episode is presented as Peter's third person

description of it. Yet from 5.1ff. we know that a source using a non-Petrine third person voice has indeed been inserted into this part of the text. The question is, how extensive is the inserted material. I would suggest that the insertion begins already at 3.11. First, this story of the Pearl Merchant for the most part really does not need to concern Peter at all. He comes in only at the end as a sort of tutor for the poor. Secondly, Peter is on a mission journey. After learning that his new acquaintance is, like himself, a stranger in town, one would expect inquiries about how the gospel message might be brought to the stranger's town as well. This does occur; however, it comes only after the story of the pearl merchant has already run its course (5.8ff.) In fact, one could proceed directly from 3.11 to 5.5 without missing the intervening episode of the pearl merchant at all. It is thus tangential to the main Petrine narrative stream. Thirdly, as noted above, there is a narrative problem that presents itself at the beginning of page 5. It is the fact that Peter, having already told the poor about the hardships along the way to Lithargoel's city (5.4-5) turns rather belatedly to Lithargoel and himself asks about these hardships (5.5ff.) This means that there is probably a redactional seam precisely in the middle of line 5.

For these reasons, it seems that the third person source identified clearly in 5.1ff. can be seen to begin already with 3.11ff., and includes the story of the pearl merchant, but does not extend beyond 5.5.

It is no longer possible to reconstruct the larger narrative from which these two episodes were drawn, but that they derive from the same source seems clear. They are connected not only by their distinct third person narrative voice, but (more importantly) also by their shared theme of concern for the poor and disdain for the rich. In this story, originally it was probably Jesus himself who appeared as a pearl merchant, later revealing himself to the disciples and commissioning them to work among the poor, since it was they who had earlier accepted him in his disguise. Likewise, the instructions to shun the rich (11.26-12.8) would have been linked to the fact that they had first shunned Jesus in his guise as the pearl merchant (3.14-31).

3) The third source may be called the "We Source," since it is characterized by its first person plural voice. The resurrection appearance in 8.10-9.29 certainly comes from this source. Since it refers to Peter in the third person it cannot simply be identified with the I, Peter Source. Admittedly, the location of the redactional seam at 8.10 may seem

somewhat tenuous, since there is nothing to indicate that the sources have been joined precisely there. The problem derives from the fact that the I, Peter source is using its own plural voice at this point (since the episode involves travel this may be an illustration of the stylistic convention described by Robbins). Until Peter is mentioned in 8.21 it is difficult to sense that one has moved on to another source at all. In placing the break tentatively at 8.10 I have simply relied upon the fact that the new episode, the appearance narrative, begins here. If we know that at least part of this episode comes from the We Source, it seems reasonable to assume that the entire story may be accounted for in this way as well.

It is not clear whether 1.1-29, which also use the first person plural, may also be assigned to the We Source. These lines do not mention Peter, so that conceivably it could be taken as part of the I, Peter Source, Peter here speaking in the first person plural representing the larger group of disciples, as is the case in 7.23-8.10 from the I, Peter Source.[25] But as Schenke has pointed out, the sea travel motif in 1.14-29 is not consistent with the narrative about the dangers on the road (5.19-6.8), which has been assigned to the I, Peter Source.[26] If the resurrection appearance from the We Source originally came out of an Easter narrative, one may well imagine that it had its own commissioning and sending-out scene (in fact suggested by 9.26-29), of which 1.1-29 could be a remnant.

There are, of course, a number of small redactional changes and additions which have been made to each of these sources. Among them the following are of particular note:

After the description of Lithargoel in the typical costume of a heavenly being (2.10-13),[27] a more lengthy description is found (2.14-29), which includes grave clothes (2.14-17), and specific reference to the soles of his feet, his chest, and his hands (2.21-24). All of this probably serves simply to identify the Lithargoel figure with Jesus, and thus might be assigned to the work of a redactor. Likewise, the calling out "Pearls, Pearls!" in 2.32 appears as a rather plastic way of connecting Lithargoel to the pearl merchant.

As noted above, the narrative problem created when Peter asks Lithargoel about the hardships along the way to his city (5.5ff.) only after having already told the poor about these hardships (5.3-4) means that at 5.5ff. the text must return to the I Peter source. Yet, in 5.5-7 the text remains in the third person voice, rather than shifting to the expected first person voice. This is no doubt the work of a redactor,

who has at least smoothed out the problem of the narrative voice at this seam, even while failing to resolve entirely the problem of content.

As Parrott has pointed out, there is a certain awkwardness created by the fact that the new stranger appearing on the scene at 8.13ff. is identified initially as Lithargoel *incognito* (8.14; 9.8), when ultimately he will reveal himself to the disciples not as Lithargoel, but none other than Jesus himself (9.8-15).[28] It appears now that we may attribute this to the difficulty with which the redactor was attempting to splice together the I, Peter narrative about Lithargoel and the We Source, which concerns a resurrection appearance of Jesus.

6. *A Redaction Hypothesis*

Once these sources have been identified it is now possible to reconstruct how this text was assembled by a redactor, and finally to make judgments about why the text was put together in precisely this way.

If one begins with an overview of the text's structure, it is clear that the *Acts Pet. 12 Apost.* is essentially a travel narrative, the basic structure of which has been provided by the I, Peter Source. It provides the two locations for the text's main action, and the motivation for the change of scene from the city called Habitation to the heavenly city of ten gates. But at each of these locations the action has been augmented by adding episodes from the Third Person Source and the We Scource. The effect of these additions is the transformation of this older ascent text into a text which shows—or so I would argue—a clearly new *Tendenz*, one which may even cut against the older myth of apostolic origins associated with the I, Peter Source.

First, in the I, Peter Source the action at Habitation would have been dominated by the exchange between Peter and Lithargoel. Lithargoel would have been essentially a mystagogue in the I, Peter Source, concerned with providing Peter and the Disciples with the ascetic regime which would prepare them for the ascent to the heavenly city. But with the insertion of the story of the pearl merchant, the character of Lithargoel is changed. His main concern is no longer with Peter, who now slips to the sidelines to narrate the action as a spectator, but with the poor, to whom he offers the pearls—perhaps a symbol of soteriological significance[29]—free of charge. No longer simply an angelic mystagogue, Lithargoel has become a Christ figure, whose primary concern is the request of the poor.

Secondly, in the I, Peter Source as I have proposed it the disciples undertake the journey to Lithargoel's heavenly city and arrive safely at its gates, where they rest, "continuing in the contemplation of the faith." But it is at this moment, precisely where in the ascent text one would expect the disciples to be escorted into the heavenly city to behold the beatific vision,[30] that the I, Peter Source breaks off. Instead, the *Acts Pet. 12 Apost.* continues the action outside the city gates with the appearance of Jesus in the guise of a physician. This is not a delaying tactic, perhaps to build the suspense. For even now, with Jesus as their guide, they do not proceed into the heavenly city. This is astounding: *though they reach the heavenly city, they never enter into it.* Rather, Jesus turns them around, sending them back to the city from which they have come—Habitation, the earthly abode—to pursue the very down-to-earth task of serving the poor and the sick.

The older I, Peter Source was a myth of apostolic origins. It established apostolic authority, and by extension, the authority of those who claimed to be heir to it, in a visionary experience of the heavenly city. It likely came from out of circles which valued asceticism and mysticism, and, so one might guess, still required such discipline from its leaders.

The *Acts Pet. 12 Apost.* is also a myth of origins for the apostolic office. But by supplementing the I, Peter Source, or, as in the case of its final scene, supplanting parts of it with material drawn from other sources, its author creates a text which stands over against the earlier myth in a position of critical dissent. Although this author may have had difficulty remembering in which narrative voice the story is being told, and other literary shortcomings, he/she had a very fine and effective sense of irony. For after all their effort, as they stand waiting at the heavenly gate preparing to receive the heavenly vision and the wisdom of the ages, the apostles are told to go home and find their purpose in the tasks life gives. The *Acts Pet. 12 Apost.* seems to argue that it is not other-wordly, mystical, visionary experience which establishes one in the apostolic office.[31] The true apostolic commission is to serve the poor and the sick, and to avoid the injustice wrought in the world by the rich.

NOTES

[1] On Syrian provenance see Antoine Guillaumont, De nouveaux actes apocryphes: les Actes de Pierre et de Douze Apôtres, *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 4 (1979), 145; Hans-Martin Schenke, Die Taten des Petrus und der zwölf Apostel, in W. Schneemelcher, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*, vol. II: *Apostolisches Apokalypsen und Verwandtes*; 5.

Aufl. (Tübingen 1989), 390f. On the date see Douglas Parrott, The Acts of Peter and the Twelve Apostles: VI, 1:1,1-12,22, in idem., ed., *Nag Hammadi Codices V, 2-5 and VI with Papyrus Berolinensis 8502, 1 and 4*; Nag Hammadi Studies XI (Leiden 1979), 202; Schenke, Die Taten, 370.

[2] Martin Krause (Die Petrusakten in Codex VI von Nag Hammadi, in idem., ed., *Essays on the Nag Hammadi Texts in Honor of Alexander Böhlig*; Nag Hammadi Studies III [Leiden 1972], 37) has offered a reconstruction of the opening lines, but the few letters which can be made out here do not support his reconstruction (see the critical text of Parrott, Acts of Peter, 204). The reconstruction of Schenke and the Berliner Arbeitskreis (Die Taten des Petrus und der zwölf Apostel, *TLZ* 98 [1973], cols. 15-16) suits the extant text better, but is still highly conjectural.

[3] Parrott, Acts of Peter, 197; cf. Schenke and the Berliner Arbeitskreis, Die Taten des Petrus, col. 15; Schenke, Die Taten, 370.

[4] So Carl A. Keller, De la foi à la connaissance: Le sens des 'Actes de Pierre et des douze apôtres,' *Revue de Theologie et de Philosophie* 110 (1978), 131-137.

[5] Frederick Wisse, The Nag Hammadi Library and the Heresiologists, *VC* 25 (1971), 220-221.

[6] Krause's arguments for a Gnostic reading (Die Petrusakten, 52-56) are not convincing. He does identify a strong ascetic element in the text (pp. 52-53), but this does not make it Gnostic. Nor does it help to identify key terms, which, when read with a particular point of view, *could* be construed as Gnostic (pp. 53-54). These weaknesses are readily acknowledged by Krause. His case, then, rests upon his comparison of *Acts Pet. 12 Apost.* with other apocryphal Acts (pp. 54-56). What separates them, he argues, is the fact that in other apocryphal Acts the focus falls entirely on the apostles, while here the focus is on one figure, Jesus/Lithargoel. This, he asserts, distinguishes the *Acts Pet. 12 Apost.* as a Gnostic example of the genre (pp. 55-56). But one might question whether the focus of this text on the figure of Jesus, rather than on the apostles, excludes it from the genre of the apocryphal Acts altogether, so that such a comparison would not be appropriate. In any event, a text's focus on the figure of Jesus would not by itself make it gnostic. Pheme Perkins (*The Gnostic Dialogue: The Early Church and the Crisis of Gnosticism*; Theological Inquiries [New York 1980], 125-127), while recognizing that the *Acts Pet. 12 Apost.* defends no particular Gnostic doctrine, still argues that it is Gnostic, based on a comparison with the *Letter of Peter to Philip* (NHC VIII, 2). But none of the parallels to which she points touch upon Gnostic elements in the *Letter of Peter to Philip*, and thus do not indicate that *Acts Pet. 12 Apost.* is itself Gnostic.

[7] The translation used throughout is my own, but follows closely that of Schenke, Die Taten, 374-380. For this reconstruction see his p. 375, and the remarks relative to the grammar here on p. 371.

[8] Book of the Enthronement of the Archangel Gabriel, 6. See S. Detleff G. Müller, *Die Bücher der Einsetzung der Erzengel Michael und Gabriel*; CSCO 225/226, Scriptores Coptici 31/32 (Louvain 1962), p. 71, line 3 (text), p. 86 (translation). Here ⲁⲒⲫⲁⲣⲕⲟⲩⲏⲗ is listed as the fifth of a group of five angels which reveal themselves to the disciples. The shift from gamma to kappa, and from omicron to omicron-upsilon would not be unusual differences to record between geographically and temporally disparate Coptic texts such as these. A third attestation of the name occurs in a fragmentary eleventh century Nubian fresco found in the Cathedral of Faras. Here the name, which identifies a large angelic figure in the fresco, is spelled ⲁⲒⲧⲁⲅⲣⲩⲏⲗ. See K. Michalowski, *Faras. Die Wandbilder*

in der Sammlungen des Nationalmuseums zu Warschau (Dresden 1974), p. 249 (plate), p. 311 (inscription). For suggestions regarding its meaning see Krause, Die Petrusakten, 51; Guillaumont, De nouveaux actes, 146-147; Parrott, The Acts of Peter, 214-215; Schenke, Die Taten, 373-374.

[9] Die Taten, 373.

[10] Parrott, The Acts of Peter, 201.

[11] More detailed attention is given to the issue by Krause, Die Petrusakten, 49-50; Parrott, The Acts of Peter, 201; *pace* Guillaumont, De nouveaux actes, 142, 150-152.

[12] By Land and By Sea: The We-Passages and Ancient Sea Voyages, 215-242 in C.H. Talbert, ed., *Perspectives on Luke-Acts*; Perspectives in Religious Studies; Special Series 5 (Macon, GA 1978).

[13] *Ibid.*, 216.

[14] *Ibid.*, 227-228.

[15] Note that the episode began as a dialogue between Peter and Lithargoel (5.5ff.).

[16] Krause, Die Petrusakten, 46-51.

[17] The Acts of Peter, 197, 200.

[18] Schenke, Die Taten, 373.

[19] *Ibid.*, 371-372.

[20] *Ibid.*; cf. Schenke and Arbeitskreis, Die Taten des Petrus, cols. 13-14. According to the Berliner Arbeitskreis the reference here to nine gates, with the tenth as "the head" recalls the 9 gates of the Herodian temple (Jos., *War*, V. v, 201ff.) and the gate leading into the inner-most sanctuary (207ff.). For the development of this motif into a typology for the heavenly ascent see the Apocalypse of Paul (NH V, 2). Cf. also the Book of the Enthronement of the Archangel Michael, 16, 19 (Müller, *Die Bücher*, p. 46, lines 18-22; p. 59, lines 7-18 [text]; pp. 57, 71 [trans.]).

[21] Schenke, Die Taten, 10-11.

[22] *Ibid.*, 11.

[23] Cf. Schenke, Die Taten, 371-372.

[24] Cf. Schenke, *Ibid.*, 373-374.

[25] Both scenes involve travel, and hence may simply call for the plural voice (Robbins).

[26] Die Taten, 373.

[27] Schenke and Arbeitskreis, Die Taten des Petrus, col. 14; Parrott, Acts of Peter, 207; note esp. the cloth and golden belt.

[28] The Acts of Peter, 201.

[29] Cf. Gospel of Thomas 76; Matt. 13: 45-46; Gospel of Thomas 93; Matt. 7:6.

[30] Cf. the Book of the Enthronement of the Archangel Michael 19 (Müller, *Die Bücher* p. 59, lines 7-18 [text]; p. 71 [trans.]).

[31] *Pace* Carl A. Keller, 'De la foi à la connaissance.' Keller assumes that since the text employs the ascent motif it must be interested in establishing that sort of mystical experience as a form of initiation for Gnostic Christians. But he fails to see the irony in the fact that unlike other texts, such as the Enthronement of the Archangel Michael, in which the ascent culminates in the mystic's entrance into the *sanctum sanctorum*, the *Acts Pet. 12 Apost.* brings the reader vicariously to the brink of that climactic moment only to stop short of the goal. The goal of the ascent is not to reach the outer walls of the city, but to be escorted into the city (!), and into the very presence of God.

Eden Theological Seminary
475 East Lockwood Avenue
St. Louis, Missouri 63119-3192, U.S.A.

Vigiliae Christianae 45 (1991), 18-26, E. J. Brill, Leiden

ACTA ANDREAE AND GREGORY'S *DE MIRACULIS ANDREAE*

BY

LIEUWE VAN KAMPEN

Several stories have been written about the apostle Andrew and often they are treated as part of one "tradition". The earliest story about Andrew, the *Acta Andreae*, is usually bracketed together with the other four of the oldest five Apocryphal Acts of the apostles, which all have a very different character.[1] In this article, I shall try to establish how two stories about Andrew are related to each other and to the Latin version by Gregory of Tours.

What the full contents of the *Acta Andreae* (*AA*) were, we do not know. The material of stories about Andrew now available consists of the following:

1. Two texts, each containing a story about Andrew which is regarded as part of *AA*, the *Papyrus Copt. Utrecht # 1* (AA-PCU1)[2] and the Greek *Martyrium*, to be edited by Jean-Marc Prieur (AAgr). The AAgr includes the already known manuscripts *CV808*, edited by Bonnet, as Chaps. 33-50, an improved version of the *Martyrium sensu stricto* as Chaps. 51-65, and the first edition by Prieur of Chaps. 1-32 from the manuscripts *H* and *S*.[3]

2. Several stories about Andrew, whether or not accompanied by another apostle, which are set in several locations.

3. The Latin *De miraculis Andreae* of Gregory of Tours,[4] containing original and added parts.

4. Other citations, statements and fragments about Andrew.

The Latin version of Gregory (written around 593) is regarded as a framework reflecting the broad outline of the *AA*. We shall see that for the evaluation of the stories in the Coptic fragment and the AAgr the importance of Gregory's version is limited. The shape of the original *AA* cannot be deduced from the secondary (or even tertiary) framework of Gregory's text, and this means that it does not give us an indication about the size of the original story.

In Gregory's rendering of *AA*, containing 38 chapters, the story of

the 65 chapters in the AAgr takes up the three chapters 34-36, not even a whole page in Bonnet's edition (33 lines). Are we to assume that the same ratio as the one that applies here applies to the remainder of Gregory's version? This would imply that *AA* would originally have consisted of some 798 chapters. Or are we to assume that Gregory heavily censored the present part of the story in particular? Gregory, or his source, must have made some additions.

AA-PCU1 = Gregory Chapter 18?

In the article in which G. Quispel presented the first translation and characterization of the Coptic fragment, he connected it with Chap. 18 of Gregory's *De miraculis Andreae*. J.-M. Prieur adopted this connection without comment in his thesis.[5] Let me briefly summarize both stories and examine the three alleged similarities.

In the Coptic fragment (AA-PCU1), a *Varianus* is mentioned. He is unspecified, apart from his name, and he does not appear himself. He sends four soldiers to Andrew. Andrew goes to meet them. One of the soldiers is possessed by a demon, which is cast out at the end of the episode, but not until the demon has described in detail how a magus, possessed by a demon called Semmath, had desired the soldier's sister. The magus had caused the soldier to be possessed by the demon himself and to assault his sister. The prayers and the chastity of the sister had eventually prevented the assault. The narration of these causal connections leading to the dénouement constitutes the core (and the bulk) of the episode, ending in the conversion of the soldier. There the story in AA-PCU1 ends.

In Gregory's Chap. 18 a proconsul *Virinus* appears, who, at the instigation of an opponent of Andrew, sends soldiers to arrest the apostle. They fail. Virinus sends twenty more soldiers and after their failure a multitude. One of them is possessed by a demon, which, however, leaves immediately after seeing Andrew and uttering a few sentences. The soldier *dies* after this. The proconsul *himself* comes and threatens Andrew, who preaches only briefly and then prays and resuscitates the soldier. The proconsul has Andrew thrown into the arena to fight with the wild beasts, but the apostle remains unharmed. The public threatens the proconsul, who is protected, however, by Andrew. Is this an adaptation of the story in the Coptic fragment (AA-PCU1)?

The stories are said to have three points in common.[6]

1. There is a devil-possessed soldier. But the one in Gregory's story dies, whereas the one in AA-PCU1 houses a narrating demon and is incorporated into the army of the heavenly King.

2. The expression "What have I done to you ..." in AA-PCU1 is said to be the basis of Gregory's "*quid mihi et tibi, Virine proconcul, ut mitteres me ad hominem ...*":[7] but in Chap. 17, too, Gregory uses "*quid tibi et nobis ...*", which, moreover, was a common expression.

3. The name remains. But Virinus differs from Varianus.[8] The conclusion is that the two passages are not related in any way. They are two separate stories.

AAgr and Gregory Chapters 34-36

The 65 chapters of AAgr make up Chaps. 34-36 of Gregory's version. A carefully composed and detailed story is summarized in three chapters. Let us first go through some general features. The proportion of direct speech in AAgr is 60,4%, whereas Gregory's Chaps. 34-36 contain 17,2% (of which less than half by Andrew). In Gregory's version, there is no trace of preaching by Andrew, which constitutes the most significant *narrative* part of AAgr.[9]

The episode AAgr Chaps. 1-12 is contained in twelve lines (Gregory Chap. 34). "Stratocleus", as Gregory calls Stratocles, arrives. His servant "Algmana" (Alcmanes) falls down "*ab inpulsu daemonis percussus*". Maximilla and Iphidama ("Efidama") send for Andrew, who resuscitates the servant. Stratocles comes to faith. The essential points in AAgr are not narrated by Gregory, that the exorcism serves to give Andrew opportunity to reveal the evil nature of the demon and to awaken in Stratocles the awareness of being of the opposite "kin", of divine nature (this is described as the delivery of Stratocles' "inner child", Chaps. 7-8). Then comes the "sealing" (Chaps. 10-12), which is a revelation taking place within Andrew's address rather than a concrete baptism or anointment. No action is narrated apart from Andrew's speech.

The whole of Gregory's Chap. 35 is a little more than eleven lines and represents the narrative of AAgr Chap. 13 with the homecoming of Aegeates and his miraculous abdominal cramp, which gives Andrew and his companions the opportunity to leave Maximilla's bedroom unseen. Gregory recounts the miraculous action, but he omits significant points of AAgr's story, in which the bedroom of Maximilla is char-

acterized as a place of prayer and not of sexual intercourse and Aegeates is characterized as a "son of the devil". So in AAgr it becomes clear that Stratocles, born as his brother, is not "akin to" him. They appear to have opposite "natures".

Andrew is imprisoned in Chap. 36, lines 1-2 (= AAgr Chap. 26), and crucified in Chap. 36, lines 3-6, after which he dies (= AAgr Chap. 54 and Chap. 63). Gregory does not record a single word of the significant passages between the chapters 13 and 63 of AAgr (apart from the imprisonment and crucifixion in Chaps. 26 and 54). These passages include the elaborate narrative about Maximilla's slave Euclia, who assumes the sexual duties of her mistress towards Aegeates (Chaps. 17-22). Maximilla asks her to stand in. Euclia tries to blackmail her mistress. Aegeates finds out, has Euclia mutilated—she dies—and has Andrew imprisoned. It also includes the speech by Andrew to Maximilla (Chaps. 37-41) and to Stratocles (Chaps. 42ff.) Stratocles is supposed to listen to all Andrew says in Chaps. 37-50, in which he brings about the "composing" of their souls and minds into their "inner ἄνθρωπος". He brings about their salvation by this speech. Andrew speaks about his mission (Chaps. 47-50) and narrates the cosmological myth of the soul, which Andrew must save. Finally he speaks soteriologically from the cross, uniting all souls to himself and freeing them from worldly bonds.

In the three words ("*cruci suspensus est*"), in which Gregory summarizes the crucifixion scene, he even omits the very point of it, that Andrew ascends the cross himself.

Summary:

Gregory Chap. 34, lines 1-13[10] = AAgr Chaps. 1-12;
Gregory Chap. 35, lines 14-25 = AAgr Chap. 13;
Gregory Chap. 36, lines 26-28 = AAgr Chap. 26;
Gregory Chap. 36, lines 28-31 = AAgr Chaps. 54 and 63.

Chaps. 34-36 of Gregory are based upon the story in AAgr. In his preamble (Bonnet p. 827), the Bishop of Tours accuses the author of "*verbositas*", but it is highly questionable whether he has deleted only the superfluous words and rendered the framework of the story. Stratocles appears only in Chap. 34, whereas in AAgr he has a key role. Aegeates is characterized as "very indignant" instead of as a son of the devil, i.e. evil "nature". Chastity, a very important issue in AAgr, is reduced to the phrase "*Maximilla ... non ei coniungebatur*" (Chap. 35). The kinships (of the souls of good origin and of those of evil origin), a central theme in AAgr, is entirely absent as a theme, and no trace is

found of Andrew's work of salvation.[11] The essence of the story in AAgr is completely absent in Gregory. Andrew's words in AAgr to Maximilla and Stratocles save them by making them conscious of the separation of the soul and the mind inside themselves. Stratocles has a soul of divine origin without being conscious of it; through that story, Andrew's words address the reader as having a divine soul also without being aware of it.

This means that Gregory did take up some "spectacular" points from AAgr Chaps. 1-65. However, he does not represent the point of the *story* of AAgr at all.

In Chaps. 30-33, Gregory renders some more action of Andrew at Patrae. Andrew gets in touch with Iphidama, Maximilla and Aegeates (called "Egeas" here) in Chap. 30. Does this clarify the AAgr?

Aegeates recognizes Andrew in AAgr Chap. 26 as "the one who once cured my wife and to whom I wanted to give quite a lot—and you did not want it". Maximilla is ill in Gregory's Chap. 30, Andrew cures her through a prayer and Aegeates offers him one hundred silver coins, which Andrew refuses. Iphidama is the one who calls Andrew in, not of her own accord, but at the request of Maximilla.

A story related to that in AAgr is the basis of Gregory's Chap. 30. In view of the relation between AAgr and Gregory's Chaps. 34-36, Gregory's Chap. 30 cannot be used as an episode previous to the story in AAgr. At best, Aegeates' remark in AAgr Chap. 26 could refer to a previous confrontation, but that does not clarify the text of AAgr Chap. 26. The theme of kinship determines the meaning of this passage, in which Aegeates' recognition of Andrew implies that he knows who Andrew really is. Andrew is not akin to his own devilish nature. That theme is absent in Gregory's story. Furthermore, the reference is explicit, self-explanatory, and does not require a previous *text*. The fact that Iphidama knew Andrew already does not alter her role in AAgr. Besides, the text of AAgr, as presently known, has a distinct beginning in Chap. 1 of the manuscripts *HS* (including a title), so the text itself does not presuppose a previous story.

As a source for the reconstruction of the original framework of *AA*, Gregory's version is not reliable. Gregory's version clarifies the original story, only where there is an established correspondence between a passage from Gregory and a part of the original story. But even then, Gregory would have selected and rendered on his own discretion, so even Gregory's framework as a whole (i.e. the sequence of the episodes) does not give any assurance as to its originality.

AA-PCU1 and AAgr

In comparing the Coptic fragment (AA-PCU1) with the AAgr, one makes a comparison in one direction. AAgr is a composite text constituting the most important part of (what we have of) *AA*, whereas AA-PCU1 is a single papyrus consisting of no more than one episode (and an incomplete one at that) from a greater whole. The question whether or not the two texts belong to the same greater corpus concerns the size of *AA*. A positive answer would imply that the large fragment AAgr is only part of a larger whole. If not, AAgr is *the* original story, perhaps without an introduction, but sufficiently complete anyway to serve as a basis for a judgment on the entire *AA*. The following comparison will show great similarities between the texts, but the size of AA-PCU1 is so limited that many questions remain unanswered.

1. The most conspicuous similarity is the appearance of a demon in both stories. Both are exorcized and in both cases the discerning of the spirits is a motif in the scene (AAgr Chaps. 1-12; AA-PCU1 *passim*). The demon in AA-PCU1, however, gets a lengthy opportunity to clarify the causes of the present situation, while his congener in the AAgr is quite brief. The actual revealing of their devilish nature is a dominant theme they have in common, but this was quite general at the same time. In AAgr, this theme is part of the greater theme of the revelation of the divine nature of the souls to be saved, especially the one of Stratocles, and ultimately AA-PCU1 is also concerned with the saving of the soldier, who is of good origin. He speaks the "language of the palace".

2. Continence is a second theme rising to the surface. The motivation determines its specific forms. In AAgr, avoiding contact with the devilish flesh (or maintaining the integrity of the soul, i.e. the disengagement from the corporeal world) is the motivation for sexual continence. In AA-PCU1 , the motivation is not explicitly stated, but continence is secondary in the whole of the text, a consequence derived from the battle between the good king and the evil one.

3. The battle between these two kings is the main theme in AA-PCU1. This can be compared with the dualism of the divine nature and the nature of the Enemy in AAgr. However in AAgr, this theme has not been elaborated by using a "military" imagery (*cf.* the military imagery in the *Martyrium Pauli*).

4. The possessed soldier in AA-PCU1 leaves the service of the worldly emperor and takes service with the heavenly King. In AAgr, Stratocles too leaves the service of the emperor (Chap. 1), but he does

so to dedicate his life to "philosophy" and not to serve another king.

5. In both stories, mysteries are mentioned. The specific conception of the word that saves (Andrew's words immediately bring about salvation), given in the AAgr, is absent in the AA-PCU1.

6. In AAgr, Chap. 33 (*cf.* Chap. 12), the term "height" ὕψος) is used as the place of God. In AA-PCU1, "height" (*djise*) is significant in the spatial imagery of the story.

7. There is a correspondence between the narrative-spatial function of the roof of the virgin's house (in AA-PCU1) where she prays and is threatened, and the function of the bedroom of Maximilla (AAgr), where she prays, while Aegeates is desiring her there. In addition, the spatial functions of the doors leading to the two places show a remarkable resemblance. Both are barriers protecting chaste women.

8. Finally, two small and general points. The magi in AAgr Chaps. 2-5 remind us in AA-PCU1 of the magus, who threatens the soldier's sister. Both are in touch with the Enemy. In both stories, Andrew's word or prayer suffices to exorcize the demon.

This, I think, is a sufficient basis to assume that both texts belong to the same corpus. The differences in emphases can easily be explained by the difference even in uniform texts between episodes. This conclusion is provisional, in view of the small size and the bad condition of the Coptic fragment. For AAgr, the range of this story must be viewed as wider than the present textual form, although this wider range, too, remains hypothetical and has no substantial consequence for the exegesis of the story. A story may always be read and understood first in the form it is found.

Concluding remarks

Parallels exist between the (defective) story in the Coptic fragment of *AA* and the one in the Greek (extended) Martyrdom, and between AAgr and Gregory's Chaps. 34-36. The stories in AA-PCU1 and in Gregory's Chap. 18 are not analogous. The parallels tell us little about the original *AA*. Gregory's story confuses rather than clarifies. The Coptic fragment gives us too little information on crucial points: the motivation for continence; the circumstances under which the soldier takes off his uniform; the meagre role of Andrew. So it cannot be compared soundly with AAgr. AAgr, however, has such a carefully composed and spherically closed[12] story that it can be conceived of and interpreted as

an independent corpus, in spite of the probable existence of previous episodes. It is impossible to establish the position of the story in AA-PCU1 (or of the one in its Greek matrix) within that original whole. Unless new textual material is found, we shall have to regard the *Acta Andreae graeca*, to be edited by Prieur, as *"the" Acts of Andrew.*

NOTES

[1] For an analysis of the stories in the *Acta Andreae graeca* and the *Acta Andreae ex PCU1*, and of those in the *AJ, APt, API*, and *ATh*, see: L. van Kampen, *Apostelverhalen. Doel en compositie van de oudste apokriefe Handelingen der apostelen* [*Stories about Apostles. Intent and composition of the oldest apocryphal Acts of the Apostles*], Utrecht 1990 (thesis, with a summary in English).

[2] See G. Quispel, "An unknown fragment of the Acts of Andrew (Pap. Copt. Utrecht N. 1)", in *VigChr* 10 (1956), p. 129-148.

[3] To be edited in the *Corpus Christianorum, Series Apocryphorum*. I used Prieur's thesis, in which he presented this text: J.-M. Prieur, *Les Actes apocryphes d'André*, Genève 1986 (thèse dactylographiée). The text of AA-PCU1, edited in this thesis, has been established by R. van den Broek. See also: J.-M. Prieur, "Les Actes apocryphes de l'apôtre André: Présentation des diverses traditions apocryphes et état de la question", in: *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, II, vol. 25.6, ed. W. Haasse and H. Temporini, Berlin/New York, p. 4384-4414.

[4] G. F. Gregorii episcopi turonensis *Liber de miraculis beati Andreae apostoli*, in *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Script. Rerum Merov. I*, ed. M. Bonnet, Hannover 1884, p. 835-837.

[5] Prieur, p. 50: the value of "la biographie latine" (= AA-Greg) for the reconstruction of the wanderings confirmed by AA-PCU1 = Chap. 18; p. 62: "Il [= PCU1] ... nous permet ... d'apprécier l'ampleur des transformations opérées par l'évêque de Tours"; p. 69: "La difficulté de faire correspondre les données de l'*Utrecht 1* avec celles de Grégoire montre que ce dernier a dû prendre ici des libertés assez considérables avec les *AAA*" (!); p. 86: "Le ch. 18 pose un certain nombre de problèmes montrant à nouveau que Grégoire a dû transformer assez considérablement son original", and p. 402.

[6] In his article, Quispel writes three times that Gregory "considerably changed ["... the plot of ..." p. 138] the story" (p. 139) or "its details" (p. 137, and he suggests "that ... he found this purified version already in his source" (p. 138). *Cf.* Prieur's opinion (Note 5). But a confrontation with a proconsul and a fight with wild beasts cannot be characterized as a purified version of a story by a demon about a chaste virgin.

[7] Quispel, p. 139.

[8] The names Gregory uses do often have a different form, but one has to establish first of all whether or not two texts reflect the same story before one can confirm that one name is a corruption of the other.

[9] The speeches of Andrew to Maximilla and Stratocles contain narrated action. *In* the words Andrew utters, the story of the birth of their "inner man" is related. See my analysis in *Apostelverhalen*, Chap. 2D.

[10] The lines are those of Bonnet's pages 845.

[11] The phrase "*verbum salutis*" is used three times (*cf.* "*viam salutis ostendens*", Chap. 34, which is used once). As such, it has no counterpart in AAgr, but is synonymous with the more general "*verbum Dei*", used four times; *cf.* "*non cessabat praedicare Dominum salvatorem*". The Lord is Saviour, not Andrew, as in AAgr.

[12] In the sense of internal references and the lack of external references, which necessitate the use of external material to understand the action. *Cf.* Eberhard Lämmert, *Bauformen des Erzählens*, Stuttgart 1955, p. 95-194: "Die sphärische Geschlossenheit des Erzählwerks", and my analysis in the thesis, Chap. 2D (in particular § 25).

3431 RA *Nieuwegein*, Bendienlaan 8

Vigiliae Christianae 45 (1991), 27-53, E. J. Brill, Leiden

'NON-SEPARATION': CLOSENESS AND CO-OPERATION BETWEEN JEWS AND CHRISTIANS IN THE FOURTH CENTURY*

BY

WOLFRAM KINZIG

I.

In recent years there has been a lively debate about the question of the self-definition of Synagogue and Church in the first centuries of the Common Era. Old certainties have been shaken without a new consensus emerging. In particular, the middle ground between Rabbinic Judaism and Pauline Christianity, Jewish-Christianity, is at present receiving greater attention by Jewish scholars. Thus in a recent contribution Burton L. Visotzky noted with some regret: 'They just don't fit; they never did.'[1]

It is the aim of my paper to show that the Jewish-Christians and the Judaizing Christians indeed did not fit the definitions of Church and Synagogue which the historically prevailing strands in both Rabbinic Judaism and Pauline Christianity handed down to us and which scholars in Rabbinic and patristic studies have for a long time taken for granted.[2] Yet at the same time there is no need for premature despair, but rather for a renewed and conscientious search for descriptions and definitions which help us better to understand this middle ground. In what follows I should like to show in which directions one should search when looking for these new definitions.

In doing this it seems useful first to ask: was there such a thing as a separation between Church and Synagogue at all? And if yes, what is meant by 'separation'? I think it is helpful to distinguish four levels on which separation could and did take place, viz. the doctrinal, the theological, the institutional levels and the level of popular piety. The doctrinal and the theological levels belong to the area of *theoretical reflection*, whereas one could group the institutional level and the level of the popular piety under the heading of *religious practice*.

Turning first to the area of theoretical reflection, we may define the

doctrinal level as the level of confessions of faith, official or quasi-official doctrines, doctrinal statements of theologians etc. These doctrinal statements on the whole aim at a definition of the way Christianity understands itself. Hence it is hardly surprising that most doctrinal statements in this sense are connected with Christology. In this respect one may point to the first kerygmatic formulae like κύριος Ἰησοῦς (Χριστός; cf. 1 Cor 12,3; Rom 10,9; Phil 2,11; cf. Mark 8,29 par. etc.), and to early hymns like the one in Paul's Epistle to the Philippians, chapter 2 etc.[3] Generally, one might say that the more importance was attached to the person of Jesus the clearer the separation from Judaism was. The evidence of the New Testament suggests that at this level a separation between Church and Synagogue took place at a very early stage, certainly soon after, but perhaps even before Jesus' execution (cf. Mark 8,29 par.)[4] In this context it is very often overlooked that the canon adopted by the Church was not only an anti-Marcionite canon,[5] but also an anti-Jewish canon. This can be seen from its designation 'Old Testament'/'New Testament' which when used in theological discourse was always an anti-Jewish term.[6]

However, there were large *theological* areas, where a Christian self-definition vis-à-vis Judaism was not only not necessary, but where Christianity was dependent on Jewish *theologumena* because it did not possess a theological tradition of its own. Just as the Protestant Reformation took over a doctrine of God from its Catholic rivals without major changes,[7] the Chrisitans to a great extent took their doctrine of God and their cosmology from Judaism. Hence it is no wonder that there are many writings which are difficult to define as either Jewish or Christian or both.[8]

This process of both continuity and discontinuity can be discerned especially clearly in Christian anti-pagan apologetics. The criticism of pagan cults, the doctrine of God and the cosmology were to a large extent taken from Christianity's Jewish predecessors.[9] The Christian character of the writings is given over almost entirely to the description of Christian practice and, less prominently, to manifestly Christological passages.

However, in what follows I shall not deal with this area of theoretical reflection, but with religious practice. Here again we may distinguish two levels: on the one hand there is the institutional level and on the other hand the level of popular piety. On the institutional level one can speak of separation when one group officially excludes another from its

community in a statement issued by or an action carried out by its authorities which results in the coming into existence of two separate, independent institutions or authorities. On the level of popular piety one can speak of separation when the two groups have separated to such an extent that they have developed separate customs and traditions which are being observed exclusively by one group or the other.

On the *institutional* level, contrary to the picture which emerges from the writings of the Church fathers, the picture was manifold and varied a great deal. The so-called 'Orthodox', 'Catholic' or 'Greater Church' (*Großkirche*) which for reasons which cannot be discussed here prevailed historically, is only one of the various streams within a large spectrum.[10] In what follows I shall argue that on the institutional level a separation took place at a very early stage. Yet in the beginning it was not a separation between Church and Synagogue, but between strands of Judaism which did not attach any importance to the person of Jesus and those which did. And it was probably only much later that out of this second group an organisation emerged which can be called *the* Church. This does not mean, however, that besides the Church other Jewish-Christian or Judeo-Christian groups ceased to exist. Moreover, even then on the level of *popular piety* there was a wide overlap between Church and Synagogue at least until the end of the fourth century, but probably far beyond.

I should like to demonstrate this hypothesis by means of two examples, viz. a Jewish-Christian group called the Nazoraeans (Ναζωραῖοι) who appear to have formed an organisation quite independent of the Church which lasted at least until the time of Epiphanius of Salamis who described this group in his *Panarion* in 377;[11] and the situation at Antioch ten years later when John Chrysostom preached his eight sermons *Against the Jews.*[12] I have chosen these examples because they are chronologically very close to each other and, moreover, because they are fairly well documented.

II.

Since the publication of a Palestinian recension of the *Birkat ha-Minim* from the Cairo Genizah at the end of last century,[13] the Nazoraeans have received wide-spread attention from scholars. This recension includes a malediction not only of *minim* (i.e. heretics), but also of a group called *notzrim* (נוצרים) which was identified with the

Christians. Reuben Kimelman, however, recently disputed this equation and instead identified the *notzrim* precisely with the Nazoraeans.[14] In this paper I am not primarily interested in whether this identification is right; rather I am interested in the question as to who this group was, in particular with regard to its being Jewish and/or Christian.

Epiphanius is the first to mention this group and he devotes a whole chapter in his voluminous work *Against the heresies* to them. Epiphanius distinguishes the Nazoraeans (Ναζωραῖοι) on the one hand from the Naziraeans (Ναζιραῖοι; *Pan.* 29,5,7), the body of Israelites specially consecrated to the service of God (Hebrew נְזִירִים; נָזִירִים),[15] and on the other hand from a Jewish sect called the Nasaraeans (Νασαραῖοι; *Pan.* 29,6,1). The latter, according to Epiphanius' description in *Pan.* 18 distinguished the Mosaic Law from the Pentateuch, refused sacrifices and lived as vegetarians.[16] Jerome calls the group either *Nazareni* or *Nazaraei.*[17]

The New Testament already shows a varying use of the term: 'Whereas Mark offers exclusively the form Ναζαρηνός [...], Matthew, John and Acts limit themselves with equal consistence to using the form Ναζωραῖος. [...] Luke, however, uses both terms *promiscue*; when following his sources he uses Ναζαρηνός [...], whereas his redactional linguistic usage like the one in Acts can be seen from the choice of the form Ναζωραῖος.'[18] Particularly important is the verse Matt 2,23 where it is said of Joseph that 'he went and dwelled in a city called Nazareth, that what was spoken by the prophets might be fulfilled, "He shall be called a Nazoraean" ' (cf. Is 11,1). Of equal importance is another passage not mentioned yet. When accusing the apostle Paul before the Roman governor Felix a certain Tertullus said, according to Acts 24,5: 'For we have found this man a pestilent fellow, an agitator among all the Jews throughout the world, and a ringleader of the sect of the Nazoraeans.' It becomes clear from this that Matthew connected Nazoraean with Nazareth and understood the term as designating Jesus' birthplace.[19] Moreover, it appears that the first Christians were called Nazoraeans. In view of Old Testament prophecies like Is 11,1 which, as Matt 2,23 shows, were understood Christologically, it is hardly surprising if the early Christians as a whole or at least a part thereof should have called themselves 'Nazoraeans'. What is, though, the relation between this old designation and the group Epiphanius talks about in his *Panarion?* The fact that apparently *all* the Christians were in the beginning called Nazoraeans caused Epiphanius some problems. His explanation is rather puzzling:

> 'All Christians were called Nazoreans once. For a short time they were given also the name Iessaeans, before the disciples in Antioch began to be called Christians. [...] When they were once called Iessaeans during a short period, some again withdrew at that time after the ascension of the Lord when Mark preached in the land of Egypt. They were so-called followers of the apostles, but I suppose that they were Nazoraeans who are described by me here.'[20]

Epiphanius apparently distinguishes three phases: first, in a derogatory manner, all the Christians were called Nazoraeans. Epiphanius actually dedicates much of the sixth paragraph of this chapter to this problem (*Pan.* 29,6,2-8). On the basis of Acts 24,5 he explains that the Christians were first called Nazoraeans by their opponents and that this term was taken up by Paul,

> 'because everybody called Christians with that name at that time, because of the city of Nazareth and because at that time there was no other name in use. Therefore persons were called Nazoraeans who came to believe in Christ, of whom it is written that he will be called Nazoraean.'[21]

At a second stage, viz. 'at that time after the ascension of the Lord when Mark preached in the land of Egypt',[22] the Christians' name was Iessaeans[23] and finally, in Antioch, Christians (cf. Acts 11,26). During the second phase a group split from the Iessaeans retaining the old name Nazoraeans (cf. also 29,7,1). Epiphanius says that this group was the same as the one described by him in this chapter. This explanation, however, can hardly be relied upon, since it is probably not based on any evidence, but rather a theory by Epiphanius himself in order to combine the apparently contradictory information about the original names of the Christians. For at the beginning of the chapter he confesses not to know whether they lived at the same time, before, or after the Cerinthians whom he had dealt with in the preceding chapter (*Pan.* 29,1,1). Moreover, he mentions in 29,7,7 another theory according to which the Nazoraeans did not come into existence until after the exodus of the Jerusalem community to Pella. 'This means that the different traditions about Jewish-Christians gave rise to conflicting conclusions with regard to the origins of the Nazoraeans. On the one hand he assumes that they lived in Jerusalem before 70 A.D. and on the other hand he supposes that they originated among Christians who left the city before its fall.'[24] Hence it becomes clear from this that Epiphanius had no personal knowledge of the Nazoraeans and has to be treated with great care.

Apart from him, our main source is Jerome who pretends to have per-

sonal knowledge.[25] It is not necessary to go into the details of source criticism here, since this has already been admirably dealt with by Alfred Schmidtke at the beginning of this century.[26] As Schmidtke showed, both Epiphanius and Jerome draw their knowledge from the same source which was probably the now lost *Commentary on Isaiah* by Apollinaris of Laodicaea.[27] In turn, all other patristic and medieval writers appear to have got their information from these two sources.[28]

What then do we know for certain about the Nazoraeans? They were a group of Jewish-Christians[29] who lived in Beroea in Coelesyria[30] next to the Christian community and also a strong Jewish community[31] and they observed the Law, i.e. they were circumcised, celebrated sabbath and perhaps abstained from pork.[32] Moreover, Jerome claims that they performed sacrifices.[33]

As Holy Scriptures the Nazoraeans used the Hebrew Bible and the New Testament.[34] More importantly they appear to have read the Gospel of Matthew in an archaic Aramaic version.[35] Jerome even claims that the library of Caesarea possessed a copy (which appears to be true, provided 'that this Gospel is really the same as the Gospel of the Nazoraeans'[36]) and, moreover, that he had copied it from the Nazoraeans[37] and translated it into Greek and Latin[38] (which is probably untrue[39]). He quotes this version frequently in his writings.[40] Jerome, moreover, says that he read an apocryphal Hebrew book of Jeremiah which was given to him by 'a Hebrew person of the Nazoraean sect' (*Nazarenae sectae mihi Hebraeus obtulit*).[41] Finally, the Nazoraeans must have had an active interest in biblical exegesis, for Jerome quotes a number of extracts from one of their commentaries on Isaiah.[42]

We know very little about the doctrine of the Nazoraeans. Epiphanius tells us that they believed in God's being the creator of the universe, the resurrection of the dead (a belief they shared with the Pharisees[43]) and Christ's being the servant of God (παῖς τοῦ θεοῦ; *Pan.* 29,7,3; the latter term clearly refers to Deuterojesaiah [42,1-4] as quoted in Matt 12,18-21.[44]) As to their Christology, however, Epiphanius confesses not to know any details (29,7,6).[45] Jerome claims

> 'that they believe in Christ, the Son of God born of Mary the virgin, and they say about him that he suffered and rose again under Pontius Pilate.'[46]

Yet this may be an extrapolation from a remark made by Epiphanius in quite another context.[47]

We have more information about their attitude towards the Law, and this requires some comment. In his *Commentary on Isaiah* Jerome quotes some fragments from the exegesis of the Nazoraeans which he did not, however, take directly from one of their writings but probably from Apollinaris' commentary on the same prophet.[48] From this it becomes clear that, like the Sadducees,[49] the Nazoraeans were very critical towards what they regarded as a tightening up of the Law by the Pharisees:

> 'When Christ came and his preaching shone out, the land of Zebulon and the land of Naphtali first of all were freed from the errors of the Scribes and the Pharisees and he shook off their shoulders the very heavy yoke of the Jewish traditions (*grauissimum traditionum Iudaicarum iugum*). Later, however, the preaching became more dominant, that means the preaching was multiplied, through the Gospel of the apostle Paul who was the last of all the apostles. And the Gospel of Christ shone to the most distant tribes and the way of the whole sea. Finally the whole world which earlier walked or sat in darkness and was imprisoned in the bonds of idolatry and death, has seen the clear light of the gospel.'[50]

This testimony is not only important, because it shows that the Nazoreans resented the oral *traditiones* valued by the Pharisees,[51] but also because it shows that the Nazoraeans had a very clear concept of the history of salvation. It is divided into three stages (preaching of Christ in Galilee; preaching of Paul in the Mediterranean countries; spread of the gospel across the whole world).[52] Schmidtke concludes from this: 'These statements make it clear that the Nazoraeans did not regard the Gentile Christians as inferior faithful and that they, therefore, cannot have required from them the fulfilment of the Mosaic statutes as a condition of becoming Christian.'[53] Hence the Nazoraeans were Jewish-Christians in the classical definition of the term:[54] they were born Jews who observed the Law out of tradition, but believed in Christ. Moreover, they did not require the Gentiles to follow their example. Consequently, they did not regard the Law as necessary for salvation:

> 'O Sons of Israel who deny the Son of God with a most vicious opinion, turn to him and his apostles. For if you will do this, you will reject all idols which to you were a cause of sin in the past and the devil will fall before you, not because of your powers, but because of the compassion of God. And his young men who a certain time earlier fought for him, will be the tributaries of the Church and any of its power and stone will pass.'[55]

This is obviously a thinly disguised attack on the Pharisees. (The sentence regarding the 'young men' certainly alludes, beyond Is 31,8, to

the conversion of Paul.) It is not the observance of the Law, but rather God's compassion which saves man.[56]

Hence the Nazoraeans were truly a mixture of different groups: with the Pharisees they shared the belief in the resurrection, with the Sadducees they were critical towards the oral interpretation of the Law and with the Christians they shared the belief in Christ, a belief which did not render the observance of the Law unnecessary, but relativised it considerably. Hence Epiphanius' assessment of the character of the Nazoraeans is quite correct:

> 'Only in this respect they differ from the Jews and Christians: with the Jews they do not agree because of their belief in Christ, with the Christians because they are trained in the Law, in circumcision, the sabbath and the other things.'[57]

The question remains as to whether the Nazoraeans—who were probably still in existence at the time of Epiphanius (he speaks of them in 29,7,2ff in the present tense)—were an old group or, as Munck claims,[58] whether they appeared in the fourth century. After what I have said so far, there can hardly be any doubt that the Nazoraeans had a long history. Not only did they possess an apparently old Gospel version close to Matthew; their theological position resembles very much the group around the apostle James as described in Acts 15. As I mentioned above, when Epiphanius traces the origins of this group back to Pella, he probably has no evidence for doing so. Nevertheless there is no reason why his assumption should not be correct.[59] They could very well have been a group which, on the basis of Matt 2,23, retained the old name which originally designated all Christians and which Tertullian attests as common among the Jews even in his time (around 210).[60] If their theological views were also reflected in their everyday life, relations with the 'Greater Church', which consisted mainly of Gentiles, must have been relaxed, as long as the different positions towards the observance of the Law were tolerated. The relations with Rabbinic Judaism were clearly less relaxed. Their strong polemics against the Pharisees must have caused some form of reaction on the part of the attacked. It is certainly conceivable that we should understand the condemnation of the *notzrim* in the *tephillah* in this context.[61] Moreover, this is perhaps the kind of *milieu* in which we have to place the dialogue between the Jewish-Christian Jason and the Alexandrine Jew Papiskos by Ariston of Pella.[62] Yet this is all pure speculation.

Finally, it should be emphasized that the Nazoraeans were by no means the only group of this kind. Rather there was a variety of groups which held the middle ground between Rabbinic Judaism on the one hand and Pauline Law-free Christianity on the other. In this respect one could mention in particular the Ebionites and the Elkesaites (Sampseans, Osseans).[63] These groups distinguished themselves from Judaism and Christianity in two ways: from Christianity by the observance of the Law which was frequently seen as a kind of *imitatio Jesu*. Matt 10,24f ('A disciple is not above his teacher, nor a servant above his master. It is enough for the disciple to be like his teacher') seems to have been used as proof-text in this context.[64] (The Nazoraeans' and Ebionites' high regard for the actual gospel of Matthew or a version close to it must be seen in this context, given the high status of the Jewish Law in this gospel.[65])

The importance attached to the person of Jesus, on the other hand, varied very much from group to group and ranged from regarding him as 'mere man' among the Ebionites to an apparently full Christological confession among the Nazoraeans.[66] It is, therefore, very important to distinguish these groups carefully from each other.[67]

Moreover, these groups appear neither to have formed part of the mainstream Church nor to have been regarded as Jewish, but rather to have had their own organisations.[68]

Finally, it should be emphasized that, whereas in the first centuries of the Common Era the Jewish-Christians may even have outnumbered the gentile Christians,[69] in the fourth century these groups do not appear to have played a significant role any longer.[69a] We do not know the name of one single theologian who could have been connected with these groups.[70] Moreover, apart from the relatively scarce remarks preserved by Epiphanius and Jerome the Nazoraeans are rarely mentioned and cannot, therefore, have constituted a real threat to the mainstream Church.

III.

The situation was markedly different as regards the second group I wish to consider in this paper. We must now travel from Beroea around fifty miles westward to Antioch. The date is the years 386/387. In this city there had been a large Jewish community since at least the middle of the second century B.C.E.[71] At the same time Antioch had become one of the first major centres of a new religion, which the Antiochenes

themselves first called Christianity.[72] By the time that Chrysostom was ordained a presbyter there in 386, there were at least two synagogues in Antioch, one in the city itself and the other one in a suburb called Daphne.[73] The Jewish community was relatively small (it perhaps comprised no more than 22,000 in a city of at least 150,000 inhabitants),[74] but very prosperous, and it played a significant part in the city's life.[75] It was probably governed by an ἀρχισυνάγωγος and a council of elders with a γερουσίαρχος as their leader.[76]

It need not be emphasized that Antioch had since the time of the apostle Paul always been one of the centres of Christianity. There were at least three church buildings, 'the "great church", built under Constantine, and the "old church", dating from an earlier period.'[77] Moreover there was another church, called St. Babylas, outside the city.[78] By far the majority of Antioch's population were Christian.[79] Chrysostom says in around 390 that there were, at least nominally, 100,000 Christians in the city.[80] It should be noted, however, that the Christian community was marked by deep splits. In 386 there were two 'Nicene' parties one led by Paulinus and the other by Chrysostom's bishop Flavian. Moreover, there was a Neo-Arian group which had recently been revitalized by a favourable rescript of Valentinian II (*Cod. Theod.* 16,1,4).[81] In the late summer of 386, therefore, Chrysostom, who was one of the city's principal Christian preachers, began to preach a series of five homilies *On the Incomprehensibility of God* (PG 48,701-812) against this Arian faction. Hence 'the division within the Church was profound, aggravated by decades of infighting, and visible to those within as well as without the Church.'[82] A strong Jewish community was, therefore, opposed by a divided Christian community.

In the autumn of 386 John Chrysostom all of a sudden interrupted this series of sermons and started to preach against the Judaizing of some of the Christians in his community. He states the reasons for this very clearly:

> 'The festivals of the pitiful and miserable Jews are soon to march upon us one after the other and in quick succession: the feast of Trumpets [i.e. *rosh ha-shanah*], the feast of Tabernacles *[sukkot]*, the fasts. There are many in our ranks who say they think as we do. Yet some of these are going to watch the festivals and others will join the Jews in keeping their feasts and observing their fasts. I wish to drive this perverse custom from the Church right now' (*Adv. Iud.* 1,1,5 [PG 48,844]).

Eight of these homilies, which were preached in autumn and winter 386 and in autumn 387, have been preserved.[83] They are by far the richest

source concerning the phenomenon of Judaizing which has come down to us from late antiquity. I should like to group the evidence which we can glean from these sermons under three headings:[84]

1. In what did the Judaizing of the Christians, opposed by Chrysostom, consist?
2. Is it possible to define these groups more exactly?
3. What were the reasons for their Judaizing?

1. The Synagogue seemed to have been attractive to the Christians in many ways: Christians took part in the services in the synagogue,[85] they observed the Jewish fasting and the sabbath,[86] they celebrated Jewish feasts like *rosh ha-shanah* and *sukkot,*[87] in short they observed the Law.[88] Moreover, there was a group in his congregation which 'Judaized' in its celebration of Easter in that it chose as a date the 14th of Nisan as did the Jews and the Quartodecimans.[89] At the same time this group differed from the Jews in that they celebrated Easter *like* the Jews, but not *with* the Jews, for in his third homily which deals with the Easter problem Chrysostom only opposes the date, but not the way in which his opponents celebrated Easter.[90]

Moreover, Judaism was attractive for medical reasons: many people went to the synagogue in Daphne hopint to get cured by means of incubation.[91] In general, Jewish doctors were sought after.[92] The cures apparently involved incantations, amulets and different charms.[93] John Chrysostom cannot deny that they were very successful[94] and therefore has problems in dealing with this fact. Thus he dedicates much of the eighth homily to it.

Perhaps the most significant step towards Judaism was to actually get circumcised. This must have been a considerable problem, too, because in the second homily Chrysostom takes great pain to oppose this practice.[95] He faces people who ask: 'Is there so much harm in circumcision that it makes Christ's whole plan of redemption useless?'[96] As Meeks and Wilken have quite rightly pointed out, 'what is most interesting here is that it is not simply a case of conversion to Judaism, for the man regards himself as still a Christian.'[97] And one should add that he is also regarded as a Christian by the Church. Hence there was quite a large number of people for whom Paul's (and Chrysostom's) distinction between the Law and Christ's grace[98] did not constitute a problem. Circumcision was 'just a single command', whereas Chrysostom points out that 'it is that very command which imposes on you the entire yoke of the Law.'[99]

2. Unfortunately, we do not know exactly who these Judaizers were. It is clear that Chrysostom does not talk about Jews but about Christians living in communion with the Church in Antioch.[100] The behaviour of the Jews who never observe Christian customs is expressedly opposed to the behaviour of these Christians.[101] But who were they in sociological terms? In two places Chrysostom says that they are mainly women and uneducated people.[102] Meeks and Wilken questioned the reliability of this information, because 'such assertions are common coin in ancient attacks on religious deviance, so they should not be taken too literally.'[103] Unfortunately, they do not give any references for their claim, and I do not see why Chrysostom's view should not be correct, especially since Jerome says very similar things regarding Palestine.[104] From other passages it seems to be clear that these Christians did not really think about the significance of the Law on a doctrinal level, but obeyed it because of popular piety, a possibility which serves to their low level of education.[105] It is this kind of syncretistic *milieu* from which the Pseudo-Clementines sprang. We know from the *Apostolic Constitutions* which use them, but at the same time oppose them[106] that they were read in Antioch towards the end of the fourth century.[107]

Finally, the number of these Judaizers must have been considerable, since Chrysostom urges his community not to spread any rumours about the real size of the problem.[108]

3. One of the main reasons for the rise of Judaizing within the Church must be seen in the decree *Cunctos populos* issued by the emperor Theodosius I on February 27, 380 (*cod. Theod.* 16,1,2) which made orthodox Christianity the official religion. Subsequently there was a strong influx of people into the Church who were not really committed Christians, people who had previously lived on the fringes of Christianity, Judaism and pagan religions, who did not really want to commit themselves, and who were not not willing to give up their old practices.[109] Chrysostom himself calls them 'half-Christians' (Χριστιανοὶ ἐξ ἡμισείας).[110] For many of them the differences between the two religions must have been trivial.[111] I have already mentioned that some were surprised by the Christian claim that circumcision and the redemption in Christ was not really compatible. After all, was Christ himself not circumcised and had he not observed the Law? Had he not celebrated Passover with the Jews?[112] Moreover, were there not Christians in Antioch who, just like the Jews, rejected the idea that Christ was 'equal to God'?[113]

Moreover, compared to the disunited Church and their doctrinal struggles,[114] the ancient religion of the Jews with its uncompromising monotheism dating back to the oldest times and its venerable way of life seemed to be far more convincing.[115] The Jews kept 'the Law and the books of the prophets' in their synagogues: hence in the eyes of many the synagogue was regarded as a 'holy place.'[116] As Adolf Martin Ritter has quite rightly emphasized one should not underestimate the visual impact of the Jewish ceremonies in this context.[117] Compared with the rather plain and often drab Christian services,[118] they were a colourful spectacle and involved not only incense and all sorts of music, played on kettledrums, lyres, harps and trumpets,[119] but also ecstatic dancing with bare feet in the marketplace.[120] Hence Jews not only had a rather high political and economic profile in the city, but their rites and customs could also be seen by everybody.[121]

The holiness of the Synagogue was acknowledged far beyond the boundaries of Judaism. Chrysostom himself recounts an incident which is highly illuminating for the esteem in which the synagogue was held by large parts of the population:[122]

> 'Three days ago—believe me, I am not lying—I saw a free woman of good bearing, modest, and a believer. A brutal, unfeeling man, reputed to be a Christian (for I would not call a person who would dare to do such a thing a sincere Christian) was forcing her to enter the shrine of the Hebrews [i.e. the synagogue] and to swear there an oath about some matters under dispute with him. She came up to me and asked for help; she begged me to prevent this lawless violence—for it was forbidden to her, who had shared in the divine mysteries, to enter that place. I was fired with indignation, I became angry, I rose up, I refused to let her be dragged into that transgression, I snatched her from the hands of her abductor. I asked him if he were a Christian, and he said he was. Then I set upon him vigorously, charging him with lack of feeling and the worst stupidity; I told him he was no better off than a mule if he, who professed to worship Christ, would drag someone off to the dens of the Jews who had crucified him. I talked to him a long time, drawing my lessons from the Holy Gospels; I told him first that it was altogether forbidden to swear and that it was wrong to impose the necessity of swearing on anyone. I then told him that he must not subject a baptized believer to this necessity. In fact, he must not force even an unbaptized person to swear an oath. After I had talked with him at great length and had driven the folly out of his error from his soul, I asked him why he rejected the Church and dragged the woman to the place where the Hebrews assembled. He answered that many people had told him that oaths sworn there were more to be feared. His word made me groan, then I grew angry, and finally I began to smile. When I saw the devil's

> wickedness, I groaned because he had the power to seduce men; I grew angry when I considered how careless were those who were deceived; when I saw the extent and depth of the folly of those who were deceived, I smiled' (1,3,4f [847f]).

This anecdote is particularly instructive for several reasons: first, it gives a good idea of the highly polemical tone of the homilies. Moreover, the mistakes allegedly made by the man are typical of the climate in the city. In Chrysostom's eyes the matter was very clear: the man's first mistake had been to ask the woman to swear an oath at all, since in Chrysostom's eyes oaths were strictly forbidden to Christians (cf. Matt 5,33-37; James 5,12). His second mistake was to take the woman to a synagogue rather than a church. Yet when we try to see the matter from the man's perspective, things look quite different: oaths were a common feature of daily life in late antiquity.[123] Probably the business in question was a private settlement *(transactio)*.[124] In order to emphasize the importance of the matter the man asked the woman for a promissory oath. Since, however, in the view of priests like Chrysostom oaths were forbidden for Christians to go to the synagogue—which was anyway in many respects very close to the Church—was the second-best solution. The man might have thought that in view of the many similarities between Church and Synagogue[125] it was better to go to the synagogue than to do without an oath altogether.

Hence the synagogue offered many advantages in everyday life, even though it involved secrecy. For people were very well aware that it was not acceptable for a 'proper' Christian to attend Synagogue:

> 'The way you act when you get to the synagogue makes it clear that you consider it a very serious sin to go to that wicked place. You are anxious that no one notice your arrival there; you urge your household, friends, and neighbors not to report you to the priests. If someone does report you, you fly into a rage. Would it not be the height of folly to try to hide from men your bold and shameless sin when god, who is present everywhere, sees it?'[126]

If people did, however, go to the synagogue over and over again, this was not least because of the success of the Jewish doctors. At that time medicine and magic could not really be distinguished. In popular piety, however, magic played a major role.[127] Jewish magic had the reputation of being particularly effective. Amulets containing small papyri with, for example, a Psalm verse written on them were widespread. It is this practical aspect which was perhaps most dangerous for the Church:

'John's sermons make it clear that the friction between himself and the Judaizers in Antioch was not primarily the result of ideological difference, though it was surely part of the dispute, but chiefly between competing religious loyalties. John's polemic was directed at what the Judaizers *did*—participate in the rites of a rival religion. Their actions made other Christians wonder: Whose religion is more powerful? Whose rites are the most effective? Consequently, John's primary goal in the sermons was to win back the Judaizers to the Christian rites—to the Eucharist, to the "sign of the cross" [...] which can ward off demons, and to the "martyrs and holy ones, God's friends," whose bones can combat the power of Jewish magicians.'[128]

IV.

Finally, I should like to ask whether or not these two phenomena, the Jewish-Christians and the Judaizing Christians, are somehow related. Unfortunately, however, we know far too little about both these groups to transcend the realm of speculation. Johannes Munck has warned us not to confuse the two phenomena: 'A Jewish Christian is the same as a Jew who has become a Christian. Primitive Jewish Christianity is in the beginning the only Christianity known. [...] Jewish Christianity is not the same as the Judaizing movement, which regards circumcision and obedience to the Law of Moses as essential for salvation. Jewish Christianity is a religion, in which Jesus is the basis of salvation. The Law of Moses may be kept as a national custom, or followed because of missionary work among the Jews, but it has no significance for salvation.'[129] Yet this seems to put the matter too simply: many Judaizing Christians probably did not really realize the significance of Jewish customs, but observed them out of a pre-conscious feeling of religious awe and venerability which Judaism possessed. On the other hand, there is significant evidence that there were Jewish-Christians who did regard the observance of the Law as necessary for salvation (e.g. the people in Galatia opposed by Paul in Gal, esp. 2,4 and 5,1, and the Ebionites).[130] Burton L. Visotzky, however, recently even questioned the criteria which distinguish a Jew from a Christian.[131] I think, however, that he is somewhat over-sceptical. Unfortunately, there is no room here to discuss this problem in detail. It seems to me, however, that there are two possible ways of defining a Jew: according to the view from within, i.e. how the Jews defined their own Jewishness, as, for example, on the

Jewish self-definition in Tannaitic Sources;[132] or according to the view from outside, i.e. how the non-Jews defined a Jew, like the definitions given by Greco-Roman sources. When we look at both these definitions, we can see that they converge in one aspect, viz. circumcision. In so far as it regarded men,[133] the *shibboleth* of being a Jew was circumcision.[134] If we take this distinction for granted, we may tentatively draw up a morphology of the 'grey area' between Judaism and Christianity. There were

1. Jews who attributed to Jesus a special significance, but regarded the Law as necessary for salvation (Jewish-Christians in Galatia; Ebionites);
2. Jews who regarded Christ as saviour and kept the Law only out of custom (the Nazoraeans). Both these groups also distinguished themselves by having their own organisation.[135] On the other hand there were
3. Gentile Christians who regarded the Law as necessary for salvation;
4. Gentile Christians who did not regard the Law as necessary for salvation, but were fascinated by Judaism for other reasons. Both these last groups seem to have been represented in Antioch at the time of John Chrysostom and to have belonged to the 'Greater Church'.[136]

Hence it is still useful to distinguish between Jewish-Christians and Judaizing Christians, so long as these labels are not used indiscriminately, but further qualified. On the institutional level the Jewish-Christians and the Judaizing Christians were clearly distinct. As far as their religious practices are concerned, however, there was a wide overlap. The Nazoraeans, for example, who supported the Law-free mission to the Gentiles must have felt themselves quite close to the 'Greater Church', whereas the third group must certainly have felt affinities with the Ebionites. I do not have space to analyse this complicated web of interrelations any further. I should like, however, to venture one final hypothesis. It is clear that the Pauline concept of a universal Church in which the idea of a justification of the sinner through God's grace replaced the Mosaic Law and the baptism circumcision, was easier to accept by the Gentiles who constituted by far the majority of believers anyway. Moreover, it offered a better way of safeguarding the identity of the new religion vis-à-vis Judaism than the attempt by groups like the Nazoraeans to reach a compromise. Yet on the other hand the more Jewish-Christian groups favouring a Matthean version of Christianity were marginalised the stronger the Judaizing

groups within the 'Greater Church' became. It could be said, therefore, *cum grano salis* that the groups which John Chrysostom opposes in Antioch are to a certain extent a consequence of the decline of Jewish-Christian groups.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bagatti, Bellarmino, *Alle Origini della Chiesa*, I: Le Comunità Giudeo-Cristiane, Rome 1981 (Storia e Attualità 5)

Baumbach, Günther, art. 'γραμματεύς', in: *Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* II, 1981, cols. 624-627

——, art. 'Σαδδουκαῖος', in: *Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* III, 1983, cols. 530f

——, art. 'Φαρισαῖος', in: *Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* III, 1983, cols. 992-997

Beintker, Horst, art. 'Gott VII. Reformationszeit', in: *TRE* XIII, 1984, pp. 662-668

Betz, Otto, art. 'Beschneidung II. Altes Testament, Frühjudentum und Neues Testament', in: *TRE* V, 1980, S. 716-722

Cavallera, Ferdinand, *Le Schisme d'Antioche (IVe-Ve Siècle)*, Paris 1905

Cohn, Leopold/Reiter, Siegfried, *Philonis Alexandrini Opera Quae Supersunt* VI, Berlin 1915

Daniélou, Jean, *The Theology of Jewish Christianity*, London 1964 (The Development of Christian Doctrine Before the Council of Nicaea I)

Devreesse, Robert, *Le Patriarcat d'Antioche depuis la Paix de l'Eglise jusqu'à la Conquête Arabe*, Paris 1945

Diez Macho, Alejandro, et al. (eds.), *Apocrifos del Antiguo Testamento*, 5 vols., Madrid 1983-1987

Downey, Glanville, *A History of Antioch in Syria from Seleucus to the Arab Conquest*, Princeton, New Jersey 1961

Foerster, Werner, art. 'Ἰησοῦς', in: *ThWNT* III, 1938, pp. 284-294

Guignebert, Ch., 'Les Demi-Chrétiens et leur Place dans l'Eglise Antique', *RHR* 88 (1923), pp. 65-102

Grant, R. M., 'Jewish Christianity in Antioch in the Second Century', *RSR* 60 (1972), pp. 97-108

Grillmeier, Alois, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, I: Von der Apostolischen Zeit bis zum Konzil von Chalcedon (451), Freiburg etc. 1979

Hanson, Richard P. C., *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy 318-381*, Edinburgh 1988

Harnack, Adolf, *Die Überlieferung der griechischen Apologeten des zweiten Jahrhunderts in der Alten Kirche und im Mittelalter*, Leipzig 1882 (TU 1,1)

Holl, Karl (ed.), *Epiphanius (Ancoratus und Panarion)*, I: Ancoratus und Panarion Haer. 1-33, Leipzig 1915

Horbury, William, 'The Benediction of the *Minim* and Early Jewish-Christian Controversy', *JThS* 33 (1982), pp. 19-61

Huber, Wolfgang, *Passa und Ostern: Untersuchungen zur Osterfeier der alten Kirche*, Berlin 1969 (BZNW 35)

John Chrysostom, *Orations Against the Jews*, in: PG 48, cols. 843-942

Saint John Chrysostom, *Discourses Against Judaizing Christians*, translated by Paul W. Harkins, Washington, D.C. 1979 (The Fathers of the Church 68)

Karpp, Heinrich, art. 'Christennamen', in: *RAC* II, 1954, cols. 1114-1138

Kaser, Max, *Das römische Privatrecht*, II, 2nd edition, München 1975 (HAW III/3/2)

Kelly, J. N. D., *Early Christian Creeds*, 3rd edition, Harlow, Essex 1972

——, *Early Christian Doctrines*, 5th edition, London 1977

Kimelman, Reuven, *'Birkat Ha-Minim* and the Lack of Evidence for an Anti-Christian Jewish Prayer in Late Antiquity', in: Sanders, E. P./Baumgarten, A. I./Mendelson, Alan (edd.), *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition II: Aspects of Judaism in the Graeco-Roman Period*, London 1981, pp. 226-244

Kinzig, Wolfram, 'Der "Sitz im Leben" der Apologie in der Alten Kirche', *ZKG* 100 (1990), S. 291-317

——, *Erbin Kirche: Die Auslegung von Psalm 5,1 in den Psalmenhomilien des Asterius und in der Alten Kirche*, Heidelberg 1990 (AHAW.PH 1990/)

Klijn, A. F. J., 'Jerome's Quotations from a Nazoraean Interpretation of Isaiah', *RSR* 60 (1972), pp. 241-255

——, /Reinink, G. J., *Patristic Evidence for Jewish-Christian Sects*, Leiden 1973 (NT. S 36)

Kopecek, Thomas, *A History of Neo-Arianism*, 2 vols., Philadelphia 1979 (Patristic Monograph Series 8)

——, 'Neo-Arian Religion: The Evidence of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, in: Gregg, Robert C. (ed.), *Arianism: Historical and Theological Reassessments*, Philadelphia 1985 (Patristic Monograph Series 11), pp. 153-179

Kraeling, Carl H., *The Jewish Community at Antioch*, JBL 51 (1932), pp. 130-160

Krauss, S., 'The Jews in the Works of the Church Fathers, VI. Jerome', *JQR* 6 (1894), pp. 225-261

Kuhli, Horst, art. 'Ναζαρηνός/Ναζωραῖος', in: *Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* I, 1981, cols. 1117-1121

Landau, Peter, art. 'Eid, V. Historisch', in: *TRE* IX, 1982, pp. 382-391

Maier, Johann, *Jesus von Nazareth in der talmudischen Überlieferung*, Darmstadt 1978 (EdF 82)

Malingrey, Anne-Marie, 'La Controverse Antijudaïque dans l'Oeuvre de Jean Chrysostome d'après les Discours Adversus-Judaeos', in: Nikiprowetzky, Valentin (ed.), *De l'Antijudaïsme Antique à l'Antisémitisme Contemporain*, Lille 1979, pp. 87-104

Mayer, G., art. 'נזר nzr', in: *ThWAT* V, 1986, cols. 329-334

McLachlan Wilson, Robert, art. 'Apokryphen II. Apokryphen des Neuen Testaments', in: *TRE* III, 1978, pp. 316-362

Meeks, Wayne A./Wilken, Robert A., *Jews and Christians in Antioch in the First Four Centuries of the Common Era*, Missoula, Montana 1978 (SBibSt 13)

Metzger, Marcel (ed.), *Les Constitutions Apostoliques*, introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes, 3 vols., Paris 1985-1987 (SC 320, 329, 336)

Michel, A./Le Moyne, J., art. 'Pharisiens', in: *DBS* VII, 1966, cols. 1022-1115

Michel, Otto, art. 'Evangelium', in: *RAC* VI, 1966, cols. 1107-1160

Munck, Johannes, 'Primitive Jewish Christianity and Later Jewish Christianity: Continuation or Rupture?', in: *Aspects du Judéo-Christianisme*, Paris 1965 (Bibliothè-

que des Centres d'Etudes Supérieures Spécialisés/Travaux du Centre d'Etudes Supérieures Spécialisé d'Histoire des Religions de Strasbourg), pp. 77-93

O'Ceallaigh, G. C., ' "Marcianus" Aristides, *On the Worship of God', HThR* 51 (1958), S. 227-254

Paverd, Frans van de, *Zur Geschichte der Meßliturgie in Antiocheia und Konstantinopel gegen Ende des vierten Jahrhunderts: Analyse der Quellen bei Johannes Chrysostomus*, Rome 1970 (OrChrA 187)

Pritz, Ray A., *Nazarene Jewish Christianity: From the End of the New Testament Period Until Its Disappearance in the Fourth Century*, Jerusalem/Leiden 1988 (Studia Post-Biblica 37)

Ritter, Adolf Martin, 'Erwägungen zum Antisemitismus in der Alten Kirche: Joannes Chrysostomos, "Acht Reden wider die Juden" ', in: Moeller, Bernd/Ruhbach, Gerhard (eds.), *Bleibendes im Wandel der Kirchengeschichte: Kirchenhistorische Studien*, Tübingen 1973, pp. 71-91

Sauvaget, J., *Alep: Essai sur le Devéloppement d'Une Grande Ville Syrienne, des Origines au Milieu du XIXe Siècle*, 2 vols., Paris 1941 (Bibliothèque Archéologique et Historique 36)

Schechter, Salomon, 'Genizah Specimens', *JQR* 10 (1898), pp. 197-206, 654-659

Schiffman, Lawrence H., 'At the Crossroads: Tannatic Perpectives on the Jewish-Christian Schism', in: Sanders, E. P./Baumgarten, A. I./Mendelson, Alan (edd.), *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition II: Aspects of Judaism in the Graeco-Roman Period*, London 1981, pp. 115-156

——, *Who Was a Jew? Rabbinic and Halakhic Perspectives on the Jewish Christian Schism*, Hoboken, New Jersey 1985

Schmidtke, Alfred, *Neue Fragmente und Untersuchungen zu den judenchristlichen Evangelien: Ein Beitrag zur Literatur und Geschichte der Judenchristen*, Leipzig 1911 (TU 37/1)

Schneemelcher, Wilhelm, art. 'Bibel III', in: *TRE* VI, 1980, pp. 22-48

Schoeps, Hans Joachim, *Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums*, Tübingen 1949

Schreckenberg, Heinz, *Die christlichen Adversus Iudaeos-Texte und ihr literarisches und historisches Umfeld (1.-11. Jh.)*, 2nd edition, Frankfurt am Main/Berne 1990 (Europäische Hochschulschriften 23/172)

Simon, Marcel, 'La Polémiqe Anti-Juive de S. Jean Chrysostome et le Mouvement Judaïsant d'Antioche', *AIPh* 4 (1936), pp. 403-421 (also in: id., *Recherches d'Histoire Judéo-Chrétienne*, Paris/La Haye 1962 [EtJ 6], pp. 140-153)

——, *Les Sectes Juives au Temps de Jésus*, Paris 1960 (Mythes et Religions)

——, *Verus Israel: A Study of the Relations Between Christians and Jews in the Roman Empire (135-425)*, Oxford 1986 (= 3rd edition, Paris 1983; The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization)

Stanley Jones, F., 'The Pseudo-Clementines: A History of Research', *The Second Century* 2 (1982), S. 1-33, 63-96

Stemberger, Günter, *Juden und Christen im Heiligen Land: Palästina unter Konstantin und Theodosius*, München 1987

Strecker, Georg, Das Judenchristentum in den Pseudoklementinen, 2nd edition, Berlin 1980 (TU 70²)

——, art. 'Judenchristentum', in: *TRE* XVII, 1988, pp. 310-325

Strobel, August, *Ursprung und Geschichte des frühchristlichen Osterkalenders*, Berlin 1977 (TU 121)

Stummer, Friedrich, art. 'Beschneidung', in: *RAC* II, 1954, cols. 159-169

Vielhauer, Philipp/Strecker, Georg, 'Judenchristliche Evangelien', in: Hennecke, Edgar/Schneemelcher, Wilhelm, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung*, I: Evangelien, 5th edition, Tübingen 1987, pp. 114-138

Visotzky, Burton L., 'Prolegomenon to the Study of Jewish-Christianities in Rabbinic Literature', *AJS Review* 14 (1989), pp. 47-70

Wilken, Robert L., *John Chrysostom and the Jews: Rhetoric and Reality in the Late 4th Century*, Berkeley etc. 1983 (The Transformation of the Classical Heritage 4)

Williams, Rowan, 'Does It Make Sense to Speak of Pre-Nicene Orthodoxy', in: id. (ed.), *The Making of Orthodoxy: Essays in Honour of Henry Chadwick*, Cambridge etc. 1989, pp. 1-23

Wilson, Marvin R., *Our Father Abraham: Jewish Roots of the Christian Faith*, Grand Rapids, Michigan/Dayton, Ohio 1989

Young, Frances M., *From Nicaea to Chalcedon: A Guide to the Literature and Its Background*, London 1983

Verheyden, Jozef, De vlucht van de christenen naar Pella: Onderzoek van het getuigenis van Eusebius en Epiphanius, Brussels 1988 (VVAW.L 50/127).

NOTES

* Paper given to the Seminar in Hebrew and Jewish Studies at Cambridge University on March 7th, 1990. For helpful criticism and suggestions I should like to thank the contributors to the subsequent discussion.

[1] Visotzky 1989, p. 47.

[2] It should be noted, however, that among Christian scholars of this century there has been a great interest in these groups and a certain awareness of the insufficiencies of our categorizations. (Cf., e.g., the studies by Marcel Simon and Jean Daniélou and the mainly German debate about the origin of the *Grundschrift* of the Pseudo-Clementines which was summed up by Stanley Jones 1982; as to discussions of categorizations cf. the references given by Pritz 1988, p. 9 n. 2; Visotzky 1989, p. 48 n. 1). Yet only too often Jewish-Christianity was treated as a kind of non-orthodox, non-Catholic or devious Christianity or even as 'sects'. It is not necessary, I think, to give references for this kind of approach.

[3] Cf. Kelly 1972, pp. 13-23; Grillmeier 1979, pp. 14-132, esp. 57-62, 85-96.

[4] Cf. Klijn/Reinink 1973, p. 42; Kelly 1972, p. 139. As to the fact that there persisted certain groups (like the Ebionites) who took a different view and saw Jesus as no more than a just man cf. below. The polemic by the heresiologues notwithstanding, these groups also attached a certain importance to Jesus.

[5] Schneemelcher 1980, pp. 27f.

[6] Cf. my study *Erbin Kirche*, 1990, esp. pp. 78-96.

[7] Cf. Beintker 1984, p. 663.

[8] This is true, e.g., for the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (cf. Diez Macho 1983-87, V, pp. 14-18) or the *Sibylline Oracles* (cf. ibid., III, pp. 249-252). Cf. also Grillmeier 1979, pp. 140-144.

[9] As a particularly instructive example one might quote in the context the *Apology* by Aristides. O'Ceallaigh (1958) even suggested that this was originally a Jewish writing

which was later interpolated by a Christian. Cf. my discussion in Kinzig, 'Sitz im Leben', 1990, pp. 303f.

[10] Cf. Williams' stimulating article reviewing the discussion on the problem of orthodoxy and heresy in the early Church (Williams 1989).

[11] For Epiphanius and his works in general cf. Young 1983, pp. 133-142, 383f.

[12] The sermons were delivered in 386/387; for the date cf. Wilken 1983, pp. 67 n. 3.

[13] Cf. Schechter 1898.

[14] Cf. Kimelman 1981.

[15] Cf. Mayer 1986, cols. 329-334.

[16] Cf. Simon 1960, pp. 89-92; Pritz 1988, pp. 45-47.

[17] Jerome's usage is rather puzzling. In *Ep.* 112, *Vir inl., Comm. in Hiez., in Hier.* he calls them *Nazaraei*, but in his *Commentaries on Matthew* and *Amos* and in *Adv. Pel.* he calls them *Nazareni*. Even more puzzling is the usage in his *Commentary on Jesaiah* where he speaks consistently of *Nazareni* when talking of the Christians being cursed by the Jews under this name (*In Es.* 5,18-19; 49,7; 52,4-6), yet says in all other places *Nazaraei* where he refers to the sect. As to the exact references cf. the index in Klijn/Reinink 1973, pp. 295f (In *De situ* 143 he speaks of Nazaraei as inhabitants of Nazareth.) In the *Vulgate* the form *Nazareni* for the Christians in general appears throughout (cf., however, the vv. 11. *nazarei* [AC] and *nazorei* [G] in Acts 26,9) except in Matt 2,23, where the text rends *Nazareus* (cf. also Klijn/Reinink 1973, p. 44 n. 2). Perhaps this reflects the usage in the *Vetus Latina*, for Tertullian says in *Adv. Marc.* 4,8,1: 'Nazaraeus uocari habebat secundum prophetiam Christus creatoris. Vnde et ipso nomine nos Iudaei Nazarenos appellant per eum' (CChr.SL 1,556,24-26). The first sentence refers to Matt 2,23, whereas the second probably to Acts 24,5. Eus., *Onom.* s.v. Ναζαρίθ is perhaps based on Tertullian or on a common source: ὅθεν ὁ Χριστὸς Ναζωραῖος ἐκλήθη, καὶ Ναζαρηνοὶ τὸ παλαιὸν ἡμεῖς οἱ νῦν Χριστιανοί (Lagarde 284,37-285,1). Cf. also Pritz 1988, p. 46.

[18] Cf. Kuhli 1981, col. 1118 with references.

[19] As to the problem whether or not Ναζωραῖος originally was a toponyme and how it came to be associated with Is 11,1, cf. Kuhli 1981, cols. 1120f; Pritz 1988, pp. 11-14.

[20] *Pan.* 29,1,3; 5,4; translation taken from Klijn/Reinink 1973, p. 169.

[21] *Pan.* 29,6,5; translation taken from Klijn/Reinink 1973, p. 171; cf. also Hier., *De situ* 112.

[22] Epiphanius obviously assumes the preaching of Mark in Egypt (cf. Eus., *h.e.* 2,16) to have taken place after Acts 24,5.

[23] As to Epiphanius' explanation cf. 29,2-5,3. He assumes the name to be derived from either Jesse ('Ιεσσαί), the father of David (29,1,4; cf. Is 11,1.10; Rom 5,12)) or from Jesus himself. He explains that 'Jesus' in Hebrew meant θεραπευτὴς ἤτοι ἰατρὸς καὶ σωτήρ (29,4,9). Hence Epiphanius quite rightly connects Jesus' name (Hebr. יְשׁוּעַ [יְהוֹשֻׁעַ]) with יָשַׁע ('to save'; cf. Foerster 1938, p. 290). Epiphanius also mentions a writing by Philo entitled περὶ 'Ιεσσαίων which in fact is nothing else than *De contemplatione* (29,5,1). As Philo himself explains, this tract is the second half of a work which was preceded by a (now lost) book on the Essenes (cf. *Vit. cont.* 1) The Latin version is entitled *De statu Essaeorum*. Hence 'Ιεσσαῖοι is a misspelling of 'Εσσαῖοι. (Cf. Cohn/Reiter 1915, p. IX, *pace* Schoeps 1949, p. 10; Pritz 1988, pp. 39-42; the same mistake occurs in Nilus, *mon. exerc.* 3 [PG 79,721 A-B]). If it is true that Epiphanius knew Philo only via Eusebius (*H.e.* 2, 17; cf. Holl's *apparatus ad* 29,5,1 and Karpp 1954, col. 1128) then Epiphanius must have had a

manuscript of the *Ecclesiastical History* which gave the misspelt title of *De cont.* The preserved manuscripts as recorded by Schwartz in his GCS-edition give the correct titles in *H.e.* 2,17,3 and 2,18,7.

[24] Klijn/Reinink 1973, p. 45. Cf. also the ingenious reconstruction by Schmidtke (1911, pp. 100-104) as to how Epiphanius came to associate the Nazoraeans with Pella.

[25] Cf. the references collected in Klijn/Reinink 1973, pp. 198-229.

[26] Unfortunately Schmidtke's study has not received enough attention in subsequent scholarship. If it had, many confusions and false judgments as to the reliability of the sources could have been avoided. Pritz appears to be the first to elaborate and partly revise Schmidtke's conclusions (1988). I think, however, that some of his revisions cannot be upheld. Cf. the following notes. As to the general standard of his study cf. the critical review by A. F. J. Klijn in *VigChr* 43 (1989), pp. 409f.

[27] Cf. Schmidtke 1911, esp. pp. 64f, 120-123. Moreover, Jerome also used Epiphanius (cf. ibid. pp. 250ff) On p. 123f Schmidtke sums up his conclusions like this: 'Für die Beurteilung der nazaräischen Gemeinde steht außer den NE-Varianten [i.e. the variant readings in the gospel of the Nazoraeans] kein weiteres Material zu Gebote als die haltbaren Angaben bei Epiphanius und die exegetischen Proben bei Hieronymus, was beides durch Apollinaris bekannt gegeben war. Denn Hieronymus bietet, wo er sonst über Epiphanius bzw. dessen Quelle hinausgeht, nachweislich nur nichtige Fabeleien.' As to the last point cf. *in extenso* ibid., pp. 246-286. Pritz argues that at least the extracts from the Nazoraean commentary on Isaiah (cf. below) are first-hand (1988, pp. 60-62). I do not think, however, the evidence put forward by him to be conclusive.

[28] Cf. Schmidtke 1911, p. 124, 281-286; Klijn/Reinink 1973, p. 52 (cf. the list of references ibid. pp. 295f); Pritz 1988, pp. 71-82. An exception may be Augustine (*De bapt.* 7,1,1; *C. Faust.* 19,4; 19,17; *C. Cresc.* 1,31,36; *Ep.* 116,16,1; in *Haer.* 9 he clearly depends on Epiphanius); yet he gives only very little information beyond what we can already gather from Epiphanius and Jerome. Cf. also Pritz 1988, 76-79.

[29] Their being Jewish is emphasized by Epiphanius: *Pan.* 29,5,4: ὄντες μὲν κατὰ τὸ γένος Ἰουδαῖοι; cf. also 29,7,1; 29,9,1.

[30] Cf. Epiphan., *Pan.* 29,7,7; Hier., *Vir. inl.* 3.

[31] Apart from many Christian churches and sanctuaries there were there at least two synagogues; cf. Sauvaget 1941, I, pp. 58-61.

[32] Cf. Epiphan., *Pan.* 29,5,4; 29,7,2; 29,7,5; Hier., *In Es.* 8,11-15; *In Hiez.* 16,16; Aug., *De bapt.* 7,1,1; *C. Faust.* 19,4; 19,7; *C. Cresc.* 1,31,36; *Ep.* 116,16,1. It should be emphasized that we do *not* know whether they observed Sunday (*pace* Daniélou 1964, p. 342). Cf., however, Humbert of Silva Candida, *Adverus Graecorum Calumnias* 6 (PL 143,936): "Unde quia cum Iudaeis sabbatum, et nobiscum celebratis diem dominicum, videmini in tali observatione imitari sectam Nazarenorum, qui sic recipiunt Christianismum ut non dimittant Iudaismum." It is quite unlikely, however, that Humbert had independent knowledge of the Nazoraeans.

[33] Cf. *In Hier.* 3,14-16. Moreover, according to Augustine, they also practised baptism (cf. *C. Cres.* 1,31,36).

[34] Cf. Epiphan., *Pan.* 29,7,2,4.

[35] Cf. Epiphan., *Pan.* 29,9,4. Jerome wrongly identifies it with the Gospel according to the Hebrews and says that it was 'written in the Chaldaic and Syriac language but with Hebrew letters' (*Adv. Pelag.* 3,2 [PL 23,597B-598A]). I cannot deal with this problem here in detail; cf. Vielhauer/Strecker 1987, pp. 128-138 who on pp. 133-138 offer a collec-

tion of fragments of this gospel in German translation; Klijn/Reinink 1973, p. 49 and n. 3; Pritz 1988, 51-53, 83-94. Papias (in Eus., *H.e.* 3,39,16; cf. also 3,24,6) and Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* 3,1,1) are the first who mention this Gospel; cf., moreover, Schmidtke 1911, pp. 41-63. it is defined by Schmidtke as 'eine targumartige Übersetzung des Matthäus-Evangeliums in aramäischer (syrischer) Sprache und in hebräischen Schriftzügen'. It probably came into existence before 150 (1911, p. 41). Cf. also Michel 1966, cols. 1131-1134; McLachlan Wilson 1978, pp. 327-330.

[36] Cf. Klijn/Reinink 1973, p. 49.

[37] Cf. Hier., *Vir. inl.* 3.

[38] Cf. Hier., *In Micha* 7,5-7; *Vir. inl.* 2; 16; *In Matt.* 12,13.

[39] Cf. Schmidtke 1911, p. 254f; Klijn/Reinink 1973, p. 48 and n. 2; *pace* Pritz 1988, pp. 51-53.

[40] Cf. the references collected by Schmidtke 1911, pp. 36-39; Klijn/Reinink 1973, pp. 198-229.

[41] Hier., *In Matt.* 27,9f. Schmidtke thinks that this story is entirely fictitious (1911, p. 253f). Cf., moreover, Pritz 1988, pp. 56f.

[42] Cf. Schmidtke 1911, pp. 108-110; Klijn/Reinink 1973, pp. 220-225.

[43] Cf. Baumbach 1983, col. 995; the Sadducees opposed the belief in the resurrection, cf. Simon 1985, col. 1549f.

[44] From Hieron., *Comm. in Es.* 31,6-9 it appears that the Nazoraeans spoke of Christ as *Dei filius*. *Filius* may, however, be a translation of παῖς and not υἱός.

[45] In 69,23,1 he accuses them of believing that Christ was a pure man (ψιλὸς ἄνθρωπος). Yet this is only polemics.

[46] *Ep.* 112,13 (Labourt VI,32); translation taken from Klijn/Reinink 1973, p. 201.

[47] Here I follow Schmidtke 1911, pp. 252f *pace* Pritz 1988, p. 55.

[48] Cf. Schmidtke 1911, pp. 64f, 108-123, 252f; Klijn 1972, *passim*; Pritz 1988, pp. 57-70. Klijn/Reinink 1973, p. 47 mistakenly assume that the *Nazareni* mentioned by Jerome in his exegesis of Matt 13,54 are the Nazoraeans (cf. also Kimelman 1981, p. 238 and n. 75). They are, however, the inhabitants of Nazareth; cf. also Pritz 1988, pp. 54f.

[49] As to the critical attitude towards oral tradition by the Sadducees cf. Baumbach 1983, col. 530; Simon 1985, col. 1549. A similar tendency is also found in the gospel of Matthew; cf. esp. the Sermon on the Mountain (Matt 5) and Matt 23; cf., moreover, Michel/Le Moyne 1966, cols. 1095-1100; Klijn 1972, pp. 253-255.

[50] *In Es.* 9,1 (CChr.SL 73,123f); translation taken from Klijn/Reinink 1973, p. 223. Cf., moreover, *In Es.* 8,11-15 (116); 8,19-22 (121) and 29,17-21 (379f).

[51] Cf. Michel/Le Moyne 1966, cols. 1060ff. As to the criticism of the Pharisees cf. Schoeps 1949, pp. 214-218. As to the combination of Pharisees and scribes in the New Testament cf. Michel/Le Moyne 1966, cols. 1070f; Baumbach 1981, cols. 624f.

[52] Cf. Schmidtke 1911, p. 110.

[53] Ibid.; cf. also Pritz 1988, pp. 64f.

[54] Cf. e.g. Simon 1986, p. 237; Munck 1965, p. 87; Wilken 1983, p. 70 who, however, criticizes the distinction between Jewish Christians and judaizing Christians; Strecker 1988, p. 311. For further references on the problems of definition cf. Visotzky 1989, p. 48 n. 1.

[55] *In Es.* 31,6-9 (CChr.SL 73,404); translation taken from Klijn/Reinink 1973, pp. 223f.

[56] Augustine writes that the 'Symmachians or Nazoraeans' 'forced the Gentiles to judaize' (*C. Faust.* 19,7). If there is any truth in this remark, it can only apply to the Symmachians, but not to the Nazoraeans.

[57] *Pan.* 29,7,5; translation taken from Klijn/Reinink 1973, p. 173.

[58] Munck 1965, p. 91.

[59] Cf. also Daniélou 1964, p. 356; Klijn 1972, p. 255; *pace* Schmidtke 1911, pp. 124f: 'Demnach sind die Nazoräer nicht anders zu bestimmen denn als der späterhin abgesonderte judenchristliche Teil der ursprünglich gleich der Gemeinde von Antiochien (Gal. 2) aus geborenen Juden und Heiden gemischten Gemeinde von Beröa. Diese Christen jüdischen Volkes waren durch die Verhältnisse dazu gedrängt worden, sich zu einem eigenen Verein zusammenzutun, in dem sie ungestörter die alte nationale Sitte pflegen konnten.' Even though it is certainly a matter for dispute whether or not the Nazoraeans came from Pella or had always been in Beroea, there is no evidence to assume that the community in Beroea was ever 'mixed', if this means that they had a common organisation. Gal 2 is no counter-proof, but rather supports my argument: The fact that 'before certain men came from James, he (i.e. Peter) ate with the Gentiles; but when they came he drew back and separated himself, fearing the circumcision party' shows precisely that right from the start there were two groups in the early Christian community, viz. converted Jews who continued to observe the Law and converted Gentiles who did not. The Nazoraeans as described by Epiphanius and Jerome are simply the descendants of the former group. As to the problem of the Pella tradition in general cf. the recent publication by Verheyden (1988) who showed conclusively that 'the "flight to Pella" is a product of Eusebius' imagination' (Robert N. Grant in his review in *JThS* 41 [1990], pp. 664f, 665). Unfortunately, Verheyden's study was not accessible to me.

[60] *Adv. Marc.* 4,8,1; it appears however, to have vanished by the time of Eusebius (cf. *Onom.*, s.v. Ναζαρέθ [Lagarde 284,37-285,1]). As to the Talmudic passages cf. Maier 1978, pp. 270f.

[61] The best discussion of the relevant patristic testimonies, primarily by Epiphanius and Jerome, is found in Horbury 1982, pp. 25-27 and Pritz 1988, pp. 102-107. A short introduction into the problem touching upon the main points is given by Wilson 1989, pp. 64-73. I wonder, however, whether the *birkat ha-minim* in the recension discovered by Schechter do not perhaps refer to the Nasaraeans, as described by Epiphanius in *Pan.* 18 (cf. above).

[62] Cf. Schreckenberg 1990, p. 180; an extensive discussion of the source problem is found in Harnack 1882, pp. 115-130.

[63] Cf. Klijn/Reinink 1973, pp. 19-43, 54-67; Strecker 1988, p. 312.

[64] Cf. Klijn/Reinink 1973, p. 73 and note 2.

[65] For the Ebionites cf. Iren., *Adv. haer.* 1,26,2; 3,11,7; Epiphan., *Pan.* 30,3,7; 30,13; Hier., *Comm. in Matth.* 12,13; cf. Vielhauer/Strecker 1987, pp. 114-128, 138-142 (fragments); Klijn/Reinink 1973, pp. 30f.

[66] Cf. Klijn/Reinink 1973, p. 73; Kelly 1977, p. 139 (who, however, refers Justin, *Dial.* 47 and Eus., *H.e.* 4,22,2f to the Nazoraeans without their name being mentioned in both references); Grillmeier 1979, pp. 184-186.

[67] Cf. Visotzky 1989, pp. 53f who, however, goes too far in his condemnation of contemporary scholarship in general; cf. e.g. Daniélou 1964, p. 56; Klijn 1972, p. 242; Kelly 1977, p. 139 and Strecker 1988, p. 312 who all advocate views which differentiate these groups. The tendency to lump all these groups together indiscriminately can, however, be found in Simon 1986, pp. 245f; Schoeps 1949, p. 10 and Bagatti 1981, pp. 36-40.

[68] As to the Ebionites cf. Epiphan., *Pan.* 30,18,2: 'For they have elders and archisynagogues (πρεσβυτέρους [...] καὶ ἀρχισυναγώγους), and they call their church a

synagogue and not a Church and honour Christ in name only' (translation taken from Klijn/Reinink 1973, p. 187).

[69] Cf. Strecker 1988, p. 311.

[69a] Around 231 Origen says that Jewish-Christians were 'rare' (σπάνιος) and that their number was in any case less than 144,000 (i.e. the number given in Rev 14,3; cf. *Comm. Ioh.* 1,7).

[70] Basil's attack on Apollinaris for urging 'the renewal of the temple and the observance of worship according to the Law' (*Ep.* 265,2; cf. 263,4) is nothing but common slander. Moreover, Apollinaris was a member of the 'orthodox' Church and bishop of Laodicea; hence his inclinations towards Judaism, if they were true, have to be seen in connection with the group described in the next chapter. Cf. Wilken 1983, p. 72 and, moreover, Schmidtke 1911, pp. 71ff.

[71] As regards the history of the Jews in Antioch cf. Meeks/Wilken 1978, pp. 2-13; Wilken 1983, pp. 34-65.

[72] Cf. Acts 11,26; as to the history of Christianity in Antioch in general cf. Meeks/Wilken 1978, pp. 13-18; Wilken 1983, pp. 10-16.

[73] Cf. Chrys., *Adv. Iud.* 1,6,2 (PG 48,852); 5,12,12 (902); Meeks/Wilken 1978, pp. 8f; Harkins 1979, pp. XLII-XLIII; Wilken 1983, pp. 36-38.

[74] Cf. Meeks/Wilken 1978, p. 8; Harkins 1979, pp. XXV-XXVI.

[75] Details are given by Wilken 1983, pp. 55-65.

[76] Cf. Downey 1961, pp. 447f; Meeks/Wilken 1978, p. 7.

[77] Wilken 1983, p. 12; cf. *in extenso* van de Paverd 1970, pp. 3-9.

[78] Cf. Wilken 1983, p. 12.

[79] Cf. Ritter 1971 with further references.

[80] Chrys., *Hom. in Matt.* 85,4 (PG 58,762f); cf. Harkins, pp. XXV-XXVI.

[81] Cf. Cavallera 1905, pp. 245-262; Kopecek 1979, pp. 529f; Wilken 1983, pp. 14f.

[82] Wilken 1983, p. 16.

[83] As to the date cf. Wilken 1983, p. 67 n. 3.

[84] References to Chrysostom's homilies are given according to the system adopted by Harkins. The columns of the corresponding Greek text in PG 48 are given in brackets. All translations are taken from Harkins.

[85] Cf. 1,8,1 (855).

[86] Cf. 1,1,5 (844); 1,8,1 (855); 8,4,5-9 (933); *Hom. in Gal.* 1,7 (PG 61,623).

[87] Cf. 1,1,5 (844); 1,8,1 (855); 7,1,2 (915); moreover 1,7,1f (853).

[88] Cf. 1,2,3 (845f).

[89] At that time in Antioch Easter was normally computed after Alexandrine manner (cf. Huber 1969, p. 77). As to the relationship between Jewish Passover and Quartodeciman Easter cf. Huber 1969, pp. 3-11. As for the complicated question of the computation of Easter cf. Strobel 1977. Strobel calls the Antiochene opponents of Chrysostom in hom. 3 'Lunarquartodecimans'; cf. ibid., pp. 357-368.

[90] Moreover, whereas the Judaizing Christians kept the lenten fast, Chrysostom nowhere mentions that the Jews observed a fast as well (cf. Harkins 1979, p. 47, n. 1; *pace* Ritter 1971, p. 78). It is not clear whether the group is identical with the Judaizers or whether it has to be distinguished from them. In the latter case this homily does not belong to the series; cf. Harkins 1979, pp. LIV-LVI. The same group seems to be envisaged in *Const. Apost.* 5,17,3; as to the Antiochene origin of the final version of this work cf. Metzger 1985-1987, I, pp. 54-57; the date is 380; cf. ibid., pp. 57-62.

[91] Cf. 1,6,2f (852); cf. 1,8,1 (855).
[92] Cf. 1,7,5-11 (854f); cf. Simon 1962, p. 142; Ritter 1971, p. 77; Meeks/Wilken 1978, p. 32.
[93] Cf. 8,5,6 (935); 8,6,4-6 (936); 8,7,1 (938).
[94] Cf. e.g. 8,7,2 (938).
[95] Cf. Meeks/Wilken 1978, p. 32; Wilken 1983, p. 75. Cf. moreover 8,5,5 (935).
[96] 2,1,6 (858).
[97] Meeks/Wilken 1978, p. 32.
[98] Cf. e.g. Gal. 5,2 quoted by Chrysostom in 2,2,1 (858).
[99] 2,2,4 (859); 2,3,5 (861). Cf., however 3,6,11 (871). Apparently during the lenten fast the Judaizers did not attend the Church.
[100] Cf. 4,3,4 (875).
[101] Cf. 4,3,8f (875f).
[102] Cf. 2,3,4 (860f); 4,7,3 (881).
[103] Meeks/Wilken 1978, p. 35.
[104] Cf. Krauss 1894, pp. 237f; cf. also Simon 1962, p. 141 and note 5; Malingrey 1979, pp. 92f.
[105] Cf. Chrysostom's answer in 1,4 (PG 48,849); 4,4 (876).
[106] Cf. Metzger 1985-1987, I, pp. 25-27; cf., moreover, p. 51 and II, p. 17.
[107] As to the Jewish-Christianity in the Pseudo-Clementines cf. Strecker 1980.
[108] Cf. 8,4,5-10 (933f) and Simon 1962, p. 141; Wilken 1983, p. 74.
[109] Cf. Guignebert 1923, esp. pp. 87f; Ritter 1971, p. 77; Harkins 1979, p. XXX, XXXIV-XXXV.
[110] 1,4,7 (849).
[111] Cf. esp. 4,3,6 (875).
[112] Cf. 3,3,9 (866) and Wilken 1983, p. 93.
[113] Cf. Simon 1962, pp. 145f; Malingrey 1979, pp. 93f. As to affinities between Jewish-Christianity and Neo-Arianism cf. also the Eunomian interpolations in the Pseudo-Clementine *Recognitions*; cf. Strecker 1980, p. 70. As to the problems of affinities between Arianism and Judaism in general cf. Stemberger 1987, p. 68 and note 154.
[114] Cf. Ritter 1971, p. 77.
[115] Cf. 1,3,1 (847) und Ritter 1971, p. 77; Meeks/Wilken 1978, p. 32.
[116] 1,5,2 (850); cf. also Wilken 1983, pp. 79-83.
[117] Cf. Ritter 1971, p. 77.
[118] Cf. Harkins 1979, p. XLI.
[119] Cf. 1,7,2.4 (853).
[120] Cf. 1,2,7 (846); 2,3,5 (861); 4,7,4 (881). As to the ecstatic effect of these dances which Chrysostom calls 'drunkenness', cf. esp. 1,2,5-7 (846f); 8,1,1-4 (927f).
[121] I do not think, however, that competition as regards the veneration of Jewish-Christian martyrs, especially the Maccabees, whose tomb was situated in Antioch (cf. Simon 1962, pp. 147-149; Wilken 1983, p. 88) constituted a major problem as regards Judaizing, for it does not figure prominently in the homilies. The Maccabees are mentioned only once in passing (in 5,7,5 [894]). Moreover, in hom. 6 Chrysostom expressedly renounces speaking about the 'feast of the martyrs' which happened to be celebrated on that day (6,1,5 [904]); *pace* Simon 1962, pp. 146-153; Harkins 1979, p. XLVI-XLVII; Wilken 1983, pp. 88-90). I do not see why 8,6,8 (937) must refer to the cult of the Maccabees, as Simon 1962 and Harkins 1979 ad loc. claim. After all there were many other saints in Antioch (as e.g. St. Babylas to whom one of the churches was dedicated).

[122] Cf. Ritter 1971, p. 77; Meeks/Wilken 1978, p. 32; Wilken 1983, pp. 79f.

[123] As to the importance of oaths under Christian influence in all legal areas in post-classical Roman law cf. Kaser 1975, p. 12; Landau 1982, p. 382.

[124] Cf. Kaser 1975, p. 445 and note 46. In general the promissory oath in order to secure existing liabilities is mentioned in legal sources (cf. Kaser 1975, p. 384). In postclassical Roman law the woman had complete legal competency (cf. Kaser 1975, pp. 119f, 227f).

[125] Malingrey emphasized the similarities between Synagogue and Church; cf. 1979, p. 90.

[126] 8,8,8 (940f); cf. 3,6,11 (871).

[127] Cf. Simon 1962, pp. 143f; Wilken 1983, pp. 83-88.

[128] Wilken 1983, pp. 87f; cf. 8,8,7 (940); 8,6,8 (937).

[129] Munck 1965, p. 87.

[130] Cf. esp. Iren., *Adv. haer.* 1,26,2.

[131] Visotzky 1989, pp. 59f.

[132] Cf. Schiffman 1981 and 1985.

[133] I cannot deal here with the more complex problem of the Jewishness of women.

[134] Cf. Stummer 1954, cols. 162f; Betz 1980, S. 717-719; Schiffman 1981, pp. 125-127; id. 1985, pp. 23-25.

[135] Cf. above note 68.

[136] Origen draws a very similar distinction in *C. Cels.* 2,3: ... τινὲς μὲν ὑμῶν [sc. of the Christians] καταλελοίπασι τὰ ἔθη προφάσει διηγήσεων καὶ ἀλληγοριῶν, τινὲς δὲ καὶ διηγούμενοι, ὡς ἐπαγγέλλεσθε, πνευματικῶς οὐδὲν ἧττον τὰ πάτρια τηρεῖτε, τινὲς δὲ οὐδὲ διηγούμενοι βούλεσθε καὶ τὸν Ἰησοῦν παραδέξασθαι ὡς προφητευθέντα καὶ τὸν Μωϋσέως νόμον τηρῆσαι κατὰ τὰ πάτρια, ὡς ἐν τῇ λέξει ἔχοντες τὸν πάντα τοῦ πνεύματος νοῦν (Borret 286,16-22).

Peterhouse, *Cambridge* CB2 1RD

Vigiliae Christianae 45 (1991), 54-77, E. J. Brill, Leiden

DER TRAUM DES HIERONYMUS - EIN PSYCHOGRAMM

VON

BARBARA FEICHTINGER

I.

In seinem recht ausführlichen *Libellus de virginitate*, dem 22.Brief an Julia Eustochium,[1] warnt Hieronymus die junge römische Adelige, die ihr Leben in Keuschheit zu verbringen gewillt war, in einer bunten Mischung von Geboten und Verboten, ein gottgewolltes Leben betreffend, auch vor allzu großer Beredsamkeit und einer Vorliebe für Dichtung, sprich, für heidnische Literatur.[2] Zur Veranschaulichung und Intensivierung seines Gebotes erzählt Hieronymus die Geschichte eines Traumes, in dem er Gott das Versprechen gegeben hat, nie mehr heidnische Bücher zu lesen.

Der Traum hat viel Aufmerksamkeit und wissenschaftliche Diskussion auf sich gezogen,[3] geht es doch um die Glaubwürdigkeit des Kirchenvaters, seit dieser gezwungen war, sich in seiner Streitschrift gegen Rufinus[4] gegen den Vorwurf des Eidbruchs und der Rückkehr zur heidnischen Lektüre zu verteidigen.[5] Seit H. Hagendahl kann die Authentizität, die Aufrichtigkeit, des Briefes als wahrscheinlich angesehen werden.[6] Allerdings sollte man in diesem speziellen Fall den Begriff der *Authentizität* differenzierter sehen und von einer *Authentizität des Exempels* sprechen, einer Authentizität, die auch Wundererzählungen und Heiligen- sowie Märtyrerlegenden eignet.[7] Dabei handelt es sich um Authentizität der Autorintention, des im Exempels dargelegten Glaubensgrundsatzes, die in der Fiktion der Erzählung literarische Realität, Gestalt, wird.

Die asketische Gesinnung des Hieronymus, sein Wille zur Weltabkehr, zu Buße und Selbstgeißelung, hatten während seines Wüstenaufenthaltes — in diese Zeit datiert Hieronymus seinen Traum — wohl einen ersten Höhepunkt erreicht und zum tatsächlichen Entschluß einer radikalen Absage an die heidnische Bildungskultur geführt. Man kann auch mit gewisser Sicherheit annehmen, daß den Asketen in Einsamkeit und meditativer Selbstbesinnung Träume und Visionen heimsuchten,

die ihn zu ständiger Intensivierung seiner Askesebemühungen anregten. Insofern ist der Wille zur Abkehr von der heidnischen Literatur authentisch und ernst zu nehmen.

Ob Hieronymus einen Traum erlebt hat, der in allen Einzelheiten mit der Schilderung in epist. 22,30 übereinstimmt, sei dahingestellt. Man wird eher annehmen dürfen, daß Hieronymus den eigenen Entschluß zur Absage an die heidnische Literatur, der im Bewußtsein seiner unzulässigen Lektüregewohnheiten wurzelte, in die geeigneten Worte und Formulierungen gekleidet hat, um ein *Exempel* zu formen, das seiner Belehrungs- und Warnintention an Eustochium gerecht wird. In didaktischer Absicht stilisiert sich Hieronymus zum Auserwählten, den Gott in einem Traum warnte und der deshalb als Beispiel dienen soll. Schon der lange Zeitraum zwischen der erzählten Zeit des Traumgeschehens (um 374) und dem Erzählzeitpunkt (384),[8] den Hieronymus selbst betont, *ante annos plurimos*, legt nahe, daß das erzählende Ich nicht mehr mit dem erzählten Ich identisch ist und somit die geschilderten Erlebnisse interpretiert.[9] Die Autorintention der Belehrung und der Selbstdarstellung überlagert den ursprünglichen faktischen Willen zum Verzicht auf heidnische Lektüre, verschmilzt mit ihm, formt ihm zum Exempel — und läßt ihn im Erzähltwerden Fiktion werden.[10] So ist es letztlich irrelevant, ob Hieronymus seinen Traum hatte oder nicht, ob er sein Gelübde leistete oder nicht; eindeutig ist nur, daß er sich in didaktischer Absicht so darstellt, als sei er ihm widerfahren.

Daher haben die von Rufinus geäußerten Vorwürfe, Hieronymus habe sich nach seinem Gelübde wieder mit heidnischer Literatur beschäftigt — Kritik, die zumindest zur Zeit der Auseinandersetzung zwischen beiden durch Tatsachen untermauert wurde,[11] — abseits jeglicher Polemik ihre Berechtigung. Rufinus hat nichts anderes getan, als die immerhin schriftlich und öffentlich fixierten Aussagen des Hieronymus ernst zu nehmen und seinem »Intimfeind« nachzuweisen, daß er den verkündeten Prinzipien untreu geworden war. Er hat das Gelübde als Willensäußerung eines christlichen Asketen verstanden, unabhängig von jeglicher Einkleidung in Traumvision oder Exempeldarstellung, — und Hieronymus hat das Seine dazu getan, seinen Lesern diese Interpretation nicht nur in den Mund zu legen, sondern geradezu aufzuzwingen.

Fest steht, daß Hieronymus seine Einstellungen und sein Verhalten in seinem Leben nicht nur einmal geändert hat.[12] Wie sollte also ausgerechnet die Einstellung zur heidnischen Literatur in diesem zerrissenen Leben eine Konstante sein? H. Hagendahl hat die Inkonsequenz in Hie-

ronymus' Verhalten, die eklatante Widersprüchlichkeit zwischen seinem verbalen Anspruch und seinem tatsächlichen Handeln auf einen inneren Konflikt der Seele zurückgeführt. »Ascetism and culture were the two poles in Jerome's life«.[13] Hieronymus strebte unablässig und mit einer an die Grenzen seiner Kräfte gehenden Selbstverleugnung nach einem asketischen Ideal, mit dem seine Liebe zur paganen Bildung unvereinbar blieb, und konnte dennoch seine Wurzeln, die tief im Nährboden antiker Kultur steckten, nie ganz herausreißen. Die so bewußt gestaltete Schilderung seines Traumerlebnisses, die Änderung seines tatsächlichen Verhaltens und seine auf tönernen Füßen stehende Verteidigung gegen Rufinus' Angriffe lassen noch tiefer blicken und ermöglichen — bei aller angebrachten Vorsicht — nicht nur Rückschlüsse auf seine Denk- und Arbeitsweise, sondern auch auf seinen Charakter und Glauben.

II.

Hieronymus flicht in sein Schreiben an Eustochium und alle christlichen Jungfrauen die Erzählung von seiner Traumvision in ganz gezielter Absicht ein: Er will die epist. 22,29 formulierten Warnungen vor einem Leben als lüsterne Intellektuelle, die ihr Vergnügen an sophistischen Anzüglichkeiten findet, durch eine Exempel untermauern. Da für ihn die Lektüre heidnischer Literatur eine ernste Gefährdung der Keuschheit darstellt, weil sie zur verbalen Unkeuschheit verführe, *adeo illis adulterium etiam linguae placet*, ist nur konsequent, daß christliche Lebensform und heidnische Literatur nicht zusammengehen, *simul bibere non debemus calicem Christi et calicem daemoniorum.*

Obwohl hier noch anklingt, daß es für einen Mann wie ihn, der fest im Glauben ist, doch den rechten Umgang mit dem paganen Bildungsgut geben könnte — so auch die Tendenz in epist. 21 an Damasus —, geht Hieronymus daran, den eigenen Verzicht auf die geschätzte Lektüre als leuchtendes Beispiel voranzustellen. Dabei eröffnet er uns, vielleicht ohne es zu wollen, welch übermäßiges Opfer ihn dieser Verzicht gekostet hat — und wie stolz er auf diese Selbstverleugnung um des Glaubens willen ist.

Er gibt an, die Geschichte seiner *infelicitas* erzählen zu wollen, ohne freilich genauer zu bestimmen, was er als sein Unglück ansieht, den Verzicht auf die geliebte Lektüre oder das Erlebnis selbst, das als recht schmerzhaft geschildert wird. Sodann fixiert er den Zeitpunkt, gibt aber zugleich eine Wertung ab. Die Begebenheit ereignete sich, als er sich

bereits von Heimat, Familie, Verwandten und jeglichem Wohlleben losgesagt hatte, *castrassem,*[14] um als *miles Christianus* sein Leben zu führen.[15] Das Letzte, das ihn noch an sein früheres, weltliches Leben bindet, das, was ihm nach allen Opfern noch immer unverzichtbar erscheint, ist seine Bibliothek. Sie herzugeben, ist das größte Opfer, das er seinem Gott bringen kann, und es bedurfte eines besonderen Anstosses, ihn von seiner Verblendung zu befreien.

Es ist keine alltägliche Nacht, in der sich Hieronymus zur Ruhe begeben hat und träumt, sondern er hat sich während einer vierzigtägigen Fastenzeit, die seine visionären Fähigkeiten gewiß gesteigert hat,[16] vor allem aber von symbolischer Aussagekraft ist, gewissermaßen zum Sterben hingelegt. Damit wird das Tribunal, vor das er *in spiritu* gezerrt wird, zu einem Jüngsten Gericht,[17] einem Gericht freilich, das, wie N. Adkin, allerdings ohne Schlüsse zu ziehen, gezeigt hat,[18] die Terminologie der Christenverfolgung anwendet und selbst vor »peinlicher Befragung« nicht zurückschreckt.

Dies erscheint auf den ersten Blick durchaus plausibel, verstanden sich doch die Anhänger des asketischen Mönchsideals als unmittelbare (und durchaus gleichrangige) Nachfolger der christlichen Märtyrer.[19] Bei weiterem Nachsinnen treten jedoch erhebliche Widersprüche zutage, die ein seltsam anmutendes Bild dieses »Märtyrers« bloßlegen. Die Intention des Hieronymus mag gewesen sein, durch die Anlehnung an die Tradition der Märtyrerakten zu zeigen, daß er bereit war, auch sein Liebstes, seine Lektüre, um des Heils und seines Glaubens willen zu opfern. Nur die Analogie zu einer Gerichtsszene der Christenverfolgung kann nicht aufgehen. Zwar bekennt er sich in der traditionsreichen Formel, *Christianus sum*, zu seinem Glauben, doch soll er in der Folge ja nicht durch ein Heidenopfer seinem Glauben abschwören, sondern im Gegenteil seinem Ciceronianismus. Hieronymus erweist sich somit als »Märtyrer« besonderer Art: Er opfert nicht sein Leben für den Glauben, seinen Gott und das Ewige Leben, sondern seine Vorliebe für pagane Literatur, um sein irdisches Leben zu retten, freilich auch, um sich die Hoffnung auf das Ewige Leben zu bewahren. Er erweckt den Eindruck, als habe er sich bei seiner Selbststilisierung in der Wahl des Modells vergriffen.

Doch gibt Hieronymus in seiner Selbstdarstellung zugleich viel von sich und seinen Glaubensvorstellungen preis. Zum einen können wir erkennen, daß der von der Kirche der Zeit erwünschte, doch im letzten selbstgewählte Heilsweg der Askese für den sinnlichen, an ästhetischen

Genüssen aller Art sich erfreuenden Mann mit unablässigen Kämpfen und extremer Selbstverleugnung verbunden war, die ihn nie zur Ruhe kommen ließen und ihn übermenschliche Anstrengung kosteten. Insofern war er wirklich ein »Märtyrer« für das Christentum, der sich das Leben um des Ewigen Lebens willen verweigert. Die Selbstdarstellung hat also ihren Grund nicht nur in Eitelkeit und Selbstüberhebung, sondern widerspiegelt auch das Lebensgefühl des Asketen.

Zum anderen — und auch das ist wohl Konsequenz seiner Seelenlage — offenbart Hieronymus ein Gottesbild, das durch seine Härte und Unbarmherzigkeit beinahe erschreckt. Ein Mann wie Hieronymus, dem die Selbstgeißelung in jeder Hinsicht Lebensform geworden war, konnte seinen Gott wohl nur als züchtigenden, strafenden Richter sehen. Stand er damit auch in der Tradition seiner Zeit — das frühe Christentum, geprägt durch den Gott des AT und gefährdet durch die Götter der Heiden, war mit seinem sich abgrenzenden Rigorismus weit entfernt vom liebenden Gott der Gnade und Verzeihung, der vielleicht heute »überstrapaziert« wird —, so zeigen sich, gerade auch im Vergleich mit Augustinus, persönliche Obsessionen des Hieronymus als verstärkende Momente.

III.

Überraschenderweise findet sich im überbordenden Textcorpus des Augustinus die Darstellung einer Episode von verblüffender formaler Parallelität.[20] Die Priorität der hieronymianischen Traumerzählung[21] und die Unabhängigkeit beider Texte voneinander vorausgesetzt,[22] kann ein Textvergleich die Parallelen, vor allem aber die Differenzen aufzeigen und verdeutlichen helfen, wie stark die Persönlichkeitsstruktur des Hieronymus seine Theologie beeinflußt und geprägt hat.

Augustinus baut die Traumepisode am Ende einer Abhandlung über den Eid und die Gefahren des Meineides ein. Als Exempel für den erzwungenen Meineid dient ein gewisser Tutuslymeni, Bürger von Hippo, der in eigener Sache einen anderen zum Meineid veranlaßt hat und deshalb von Augustinus verurteilt wird. Ein solcher Mann sei schlimmer als ein Mörder, da dieser das Leben raube, jener aber die eigene Seele und die des Meineidigen töte.

Zur Verdeutlichung dieses strengen Urteils erzählt Augustinus eine Geschichte, die er von jenem Tutuslymeni gehört habe. Damit manifestiert sich, abgesehen von der übereinstimmenden didaktisch-

warnenden Absicht, die durch die Autorität eines göttlichen Traumes untermauert wird, ein erster Unterschied zu Hieronymus. Hatte dieser in der ersten Person seine »persönlichen« Erfahrungen berichtet, erzählt Augustinus die Geschichte mittelbar in der dritten Person. Eine weitere Erzählebene ist dazwischen geschoben; wenn auch der Anspruch der Authentizität dadurch kaum gemindert wird,[23] ist die Haltung des Augustinus zu seinem Exempel distanziert, objektiv. Die Person des Tutuslymeni bleibt auf ihre Funktionalität beschränkt, die völlig auf Belehrung ausgerichtet ist. So ist es Augustinus auch möglich, nach Abschluß der Exempelerzählung die allgemein gültige Conclusio zu ziehen und an die zu Belehrenden weiterzugeben. Hieronymus dagegen, den das Selbsterlebte oder besser das Selbsterfahrene[24] auch beim Erzählvorgang wieder betroffen macht, den die Selbstdarstellung vereinnahmt, bleibt bis zum Ende im Ich befangen. Die Adressaten seines *Libellus* können die ausgesprochene Warnung, die didaktische Absicht, nur mehr implizit erfassen. Die Unmittelbarkeit des erzählten »Erlebten« läßt ihn unfähig werden für eine Hinwendung an das Du. Hieronymus sieht sich abermals mit dem Problem konfrontiert, das er bewältigt glaubte und in seiner Erzählung als bewältigt darstellen wollte. Seine Selbststilisierung ist unvermittelt brüchig geworden.

Die neuerliche Hinwendung zum Du erfolgt deutlich abgesetzt, ohne Zusammenhang zum Vorhergehenden; sie hat die *avaritia*, also ein völlig neues Thema, zum Inhalt und streicht Hieronymus' »Sich-Verlieren-im-Selbst« umso klarer heraus.

Sind beide Autoren von ähnlichen Voraussetzungen ausgegangen, eine warnende Belehrung durch die Autorität der traditionsreichen Traumvision zu stärken, so hat Augustinus seine didaktische Absicht konsequent und linear verfolgt, während bei Hieronymus die Belehrungsabsicht immer wieder von einem Hang zur Selbstdarstellung überlagert und durchbrochen wird, der seine Ausgestaltung der Traumvision mit individuellen Konflikten belastet.

So wird die »Vorladung« vor das Gericht bei beiden Autoren in ähnlichen Formulierungen abgehandelt, doch die Übereinstimmung bleibt formaler Natur und äußerlich.

> Aug. serm. 308: ... *ipsa nocte exhibitum se fuisse ad iudicem, et cum magno impetu atque terrore se pervenisse ad praesidentem excelsum quendam et admirabilem virum, cui parebat officium similiter excelsorum, iussum fuisse perturbatum retro revocari et interrogatum fuisse.*
>
> Hier. epist. 22,30: *Cum subito raptus in spiritu, ad tribunal iudicis pertrahor; ubi tantum luminis, et tantum erat ex circumstantium claritate fulgo-*

ris, ut proiectus in terram, sursum aspicere non auderem. Interrogatus de condicione, Christianum me esse respondi.

Die Traumsituation, Angst und Verwirrung finden sich bei beiden Autoren, desgleichen die etwas vage Identifizierung des Richters. Gerade in der Person des Richters zeigen sich aber deutliche Unterschiede. Während Augustinus, dem Thema des gerichtlichen Meineides angemessen, eher auf einer profanen Ebene verbleibt — sein Gericht gleicht nur himmlischen Heerscharen, *praesidentem ... quendam ... officium similiter excelsorum* —, betont Hieronymus mit Anspielungen auf die Heilige Schrift die Erhabenheit der Situation und die Absolutheit des Tribunals. Der dreimalige Verweis auf Licht, Glanz und Strahlen, *lumen, claritas, fulgor,*[25] die das Tribunal begleiten, definiert den Richter eindeutig als göttliches Wesen, als *Iesus kyrios*, und erhebt das Tribunal zum Jüngsten Gericht. Die Betonung der Todesgefahr für Hieronymus entspricht dieser Deutung. Zugleich erinnern die Worte *proiectus in terram, sursum aspicere non auderem* an die Christophanie bei der Bekehrung des Saulus/Paulus auf dem Weg nach Damaskus, die auch als einzige biblische Christophanie eine Lichtepiphanie ist.[26] Hieronymus reiht sich damit in die Zahl jener Auserwählten ein, die Gott/Christus von Angesicht zu Angesicht sehen durften.[27] Das Eingeständnis des eigenen Fehlverhaltens wird zum Mittel der Selbsterhöhung: Wie aus Saulus ein Paulus wurde, ist der *Ciceronianus* zum bedeutenden Bibelübersetzer und -exegeten im Dienste des Glaubens geworden.

Hieronymus mischt in die traditionsreiche Form des *Traums als Warnung*, die auch Augustinus für sein Exempel gewählt hat, das ebenso traditionsreiche Motiv der Epiphanie,[28] um das Außergewöhnliche seiner Situation herauszustreichen. Die Tatsache, daß der Erlebende und der Beschreibende einer Epiphanie nur sehr selten identisch zu sein pflegen und daß Epiphanien immer der Gemeinschaft dienen und niemals privat sind,[29] legt nahe, daß bei Hieronymus fiktionale Selbststilisierung vorliegt.

Gerade deshalb läßt aber das von ihm im Verhör präsentierte Gottesbild unmittelbare Rückschlüsse auf seine persönliche Gottesvorstellung und Gotteserfahrung zu. Zwar enthalten bei ihm wie bei Augustinus die ersten in direkter Rede angeführten Worte des Richters den Anklagepunkt, bei Augustinus in Form einer Frage, bei Hieronymus als Behauptung formuliert, doch läßt sich der Richter bei Augustinus auf eine Rechtfertigung des Beschuldigten ein, die, erst widerlegt, diesen zur Ein-

sicht seiner Schuld bringen soll, während Hieronymus sofort geschlagen wird, um zu einem Bekenntnis seiner Schuld zu kommen.

> Aug. serm. 308: *Quare provocasti hominem ad iurationem, quem sciebas falsum esse iuraturum? Respondit ille: Negavit mihi rem meam. Responsum est illi: et nonne melius erat, ut rem tuam quam exigebas perderes, quam animam hominis istius falsa iuratione perimeres?*

> Hier. epist. 22,30: *Mentiris, ait, Ciceronianus es, non Christianus: ubi enim thesaurus tuus, ibi et cor tuum.*[30] *Illico obmutui, et inter verbera (nam caedi me iusserat) conscientiae magis igne torquebar, illum mecum versiculum reputans: In inferno autem quis confitebitur tibi? Clamare tamen coepi, et eiulans dicere: Miserere mei, Domine, miserere mei. Haec vox inter flagella resonabat.*

Man kann bei Hieronymus durchaus von einer »Erziehungsfolter« in der Terminologie der Christenverfolgung sprechen, während Tutuslymeni für sein begangenes Unrecht bestraft wird. Wenige Worte vermögen Tutuslymeni zur Einsicht zu bringen, dagegen wendet der Richter des Hieronymus sofort härtere Mittel an, deren Schmerzhaftigkeit und lange Dauer detailreich erzählt werden, wie auch Gedanken und Gnadengesuche des Gezüchtigten.[31] Immerhin ist die Prozedur von Erfolge gekrönt, denn *inter verbera ... conscientiae magis igne torquebar*, doch all die (eingebleute) Reue vermag den unerbittlichen Richter nicht umzustimmen, nur neue Schläge antworten Hieronymus auf sein Flehen um Erbarmen.[32]

Es bedarf der Fürbitten der umstehenden Engel, die mit dem Hinweis auf die Jugend des Angeklagten um Gnade bitten, doch die Möglichkeit zur Busse zu geben und die Todesstrafe erst dann zu verhängen, wenn er wieder zu heidnischen Büchern greifen sollte. Doch das Ende der Züchtigung kann erst der Schwur aus dem Mund des Angeklagten selbst erwirken.

> Hier. epist. 22,30: *Ego qui in tanto constrictus articulo, vellem etiam maiora promittere, deierare coepi et nomen eius obtestans, dicere, Domine si umquam habuero codices saeculares, si legero, te negavi. In haec sacramenti verba dimissus, revertor ad superos.*

Hieronymus betont, daß die Todesgefahr erst mit seinem Eid, seinem Gelübde gebannt war, und er gibt auch zu, daß er in dieser bedrängten Situation zu allem bereit gewesen wäre, so auch, keine paganen Bücher mehr zu lesen, zu besitzen oder auch nur in die Hand zu nehmen.

Damit aber kommt es in seiner Selbststilisierung als Märtyrer zur Groteske: Seine gelobte Absage an die pagane Literatur ist ein durch

Folter und Todesgefahr erzwungener Akt; die verleugnete pagane Kultur wird in Analogie zum Glauben der Märtyrer unsinnig aufgewertet; die eigentliche Intention des Hieronymus, sein Opfer für den Glauben als beispielhafte Handlung darzustellen, geht beinahe verloren.[33] Damit dennoch sein »Opfer« Eustochium zur Nachfolge eines gottgefälligen Lebens anstachle, beeilt Hieronymus sich, die Relevanz des Traumes für sein (reales) Leben zu versichern.

> Hier. epist. 22,30: *Nec vero sopor ille fuerat, aut vana somnia, quibus saepe deludimur. Testis est tribunal illud, ante quod iacui, testis iudicium triste, quod timui: ita mihi nunquam contingat in talem incidere quaestionem. Liventes fateor me habuisse scapulos, plagas sensisse post somnum, et tanto dehinc studio divina legisse, quanto non ante mortalia legeram.*

Die fiktionale Erlebnisschilderung, die aus einer authentischen psychischen Konfliktsituation entstanden ist, wird durch ihre betonte Wirkung auf die Realität mit scheinbarer Faktizität unterlegt, einer Faktizität, die für die didaktische Wirkabsicht des Autors unverzichtbar erscheint. Es ist ihm wichtig, bei aller — bewußten oder unbewußten — Selbststilisierung in den traditionsreichen Formen von Märtyrerlegende, Traumvision und Epiphanie, die absolute Glaubwürdigkeit seiner Aussagen, ihren »Sitz im Leben«, versichern, und er benutzt dazu, nicht minder traditionell, das Motiv der Zeugenschaft und des konkreten Weiterwirkens des Traumes in psychischer (Änderung der Lektüre-Gewohnheiten) und physischer Hinsicht (blaue Flecken nach dem Erwachen).

Letzteres hat in gleicher Absicht einer didaktischen Echtheitsbeglaubigung auch Augustinus verwendet,[34] doch faßt er sich sehr kurz, um zu seinem eigentlichen Anliegen zu kommen: die Lehre aus dem Exempel zu ziehen. Augustinus kann es im Unterschied zu Hieronymus ja nicht im selben Ausmaß darum gehen, die Relevanz des Traumerlebnisses für die Realität zu betonen, da er den Exempelcharakter seiner Erzählung von Anfang an stärker gewichtet und auf Selbstdarstellung völlig verzichtet hat. Für ihn ist nicht wichtig, was mit Tutuslymeni im einzelnen nach dem Traum geschah — Tutuslymeni ist begrenzte Exempelfigur, während der träumende Hieronymus in der Person des erzählenden Hieronymus die Grenzen des Exempels überschreitet —, sondern nur die Wirkung auf den Rezipienten. Nicht Tutuslymeni und seine Traumerfahrung sind von Bedeutung, sondern die im Exempel vermittelte Botschaft, nicht der konkrete Inhalt, sondern die abstrakte Lehre.

Damit ist wohl der — neben allen Detaildifferenzen — gravierendste Unterschied zwischen dem Exempel des Augustinus und der Traum-

schilderung des Hieronymus formuliert: Während für Augustinus das Exempel Mittel zum Zweck ist, geht es Hieronymus immer auch um die eigene Person. Beide verfolgen eine didaktische Absicht, beide benutzten für ihre Zwecke traditionelle Formen der christlichen Literatur, beide arbeiten mit der *Authentizität des Exempels*, doch fließen bei Hieronymus als Ich-Erzähler in stärkerem Ausmaß subjektive Gegebenheiten und somit auch personbezogene Widersprüche ein. Seiner zum Zeitpunkt der Abfassung des Briefes tatsächlichen Reserviertheit paganer Literatur gegenüber und dem Willen, diese weiter zu vermitteln, steht sein unwiderstehlicher Hang zur Selbstdarstellung gegenüber, der ihn zur Selbststilisierung als Märtyrer und auserwählten Bekehrten, also auch zur Übertreibung, veranlaßt.

Gerade der Wunsch, dem eigenen Märtyrertum in Form einer Traum-Epiphanie ein schriftliches Denkmal zu setzen, bot in der Folge Rufinus die nötige Angriffsfläche. Eine bloße Belehrung, eine Meinungsäußerung, auch eine offizielle Stellungnahme zur Frage heidnischer Lektüre, hätte Hieronymus mit einiger Courage modifizieren, seinem tatsächlichen späteren Verhalten angleichen können, einen im Angesicht Gottes geleisteten Eid in Verbindung mit einer Selbstverfluchung im Falle eines Eidbruches konnte ein Mann von Selbstverständnis des Hieronymus nicht gut widerrufen.[35] Er war gezwungen, der Anklage des Rufinus mit Ausflüchten zu begegnen. Für den modernen Betrachter sind freilich diese Verteidigungsversuche entlarvender, als es die Beschuldigungen des Rufinus sein konnten.

IV.

Hauptanliegen der Pammachius und Marcella gewidmeten *Apologia adversus libros Rufini* des Hieronymus ist eine klärende Stellungnahme zu seiner Position im Streit um die Lehre des Origenes.[36] Doch ist Hieronymus gezwungen, auf den konkreten Vorwurf des Eidbruches gegenüber Gott einzugehen, kann er doch eine derart schwerwiegende Anschuldigung, die noch dazu in einer an Papst Anastasius gerichteten Schrift geäußert wird, nicht unerwidert lassen.

Hieronymus hat nach eigenen Angaben die Schrift des Rufinus zu diesem Zeitpunkt nicht vor Augen gehabt,[37] doch Freunde und Bruder müssen ihn von den Anschuldigungen aufs genaueste unterrichtet haben,[38] da er in der Lage ist, die Anklagen des Rufinus detailliert zu referieren.

> Adv. Ruf. 1,30: *Obiicit mihi periurium et mixtum sacrilegio, quod in libro quo ad instituendam Christi virginem loquor, ante tribunal iudicis dormiens pollicitus sim, nunquam me litteris saecularibus daturum operam, et nihilominus damnatae eruditionis interdum meminerim.*

Man kann Hieronymus so manches vorwerfen, aber gewiß nicht mangelnde Taktik in seiner Verteidigung. Immerhin baut er jene beiden Entlastungsargumente, auf die sich seine Rechtfertigung hauptsächlich stützen wird, bereits in die Wiedergabe der Anklageschrift (!) ein. So ist einerseits davon die Rede, daß er im Schlaf, *dormiens*, seine Versprechungen machte; eine Formulierung, die sich nicht im Originalwortlaut des Rufinus findet. Andererseits erweitert er das angeblich gegebene Versprechen dahingehend, daß er nicht nur aufhören würde, pagane Bücher zu lesen, sondern daß Rufinus auch noch von ihm erwartet hätte, daß er alles bisher Gelesene, seine gesamte Erziehung, vergessen sollte; auch davon ist bei Rufinus nicht die Rede. In der Tat sind das Motiv des Traumgeschehens, das an sich bedeutungslos ist, und das bloße Zitieren aus dem Gedächtnis jene Verteidigungspunkte, die beinahe leitmotivisch seine Rechtfertigung durchziehen und sie tragen.[39]

> Adv. Ruf. 1,30: *Nunc quod instat, pro sacrilegio atque periurio somnii respondendum est. Dixi me saeculares litteras deinceps non lecturum: de futuro sponsio est, non praeteritae memoriae abolitio.*

Nachdem Hieronymus seine Verteidigungsstrategie prinzipell festgelegt hat, beginnt er mit den Angriffen zu spielen, um zu zeigen, wie wenig sie ihn getroffen hätten. Immer wieder insistiert er auf der Nichtigkeit seines Traumes:

> Adv. Ruf. 1,31: *Haec dicerem, si quippiam vigilans promisissem. Nunc autem, novum impudentiae genus, obicit mihi somnium meum... Sed tamen qui somnium criminatur, audiat prophetarum voces, somniis non esse credendum, quia nec adulterium somni ducit me ad tartarum, nec corona martyrii in coelum levat.*

Freilich geht es dabei nicht ohne Polemik gegen den Ankläger ab, nicht ohne Angriffe als neue Verteidigungsstrategie, die in der Folge die Argumentation zusehends ersetzt. Letztlich gelingt es Hieronymus mit Schonungslosigkeit und Zynismus gegen den Gegner, den Leser immer weiter von den gegen ihn erhobenen Vorwürfen wegzuführen. Längst geht es nicht mehr darum, die Argumente des Rufinus Punkt für Punkt zu widerlegen. Plötzlich ist nicht mehr Hieronymus der Angeklagte, sondern Rufinus der Sünder, dem Hieronymus, nun ganz Lehrer und

milder Erzieher, Gebote auferlegt und Belehrungen zukommen läßt; in gewohnter Souveränität untermauert er seine Ausführungen mit Bibelzitaten. Nun kann er sich auch großherzig zeigen, dem Gegner Versöhnung, um der Einheit der Kirche willen, anbieten, wie es wohl nur dem Überlegenen zukommt, freilich auch dessen Vorgehen gegen ihn als Ungezogenheit tadeln, da es den christlichen Geboten widerspräche.

Hieronymus scheint sein Ziel fürs erste — eher aufgrund rhetorischen Geschicks als durch gute Argumente — erreicht zu haben und wendet sich weiteren Vorwürfen des Rufinus zu. Die Anklage gegen seine Person ist entkräftet, er hat nur geträumt und das Bildungsgut seiner Jugend nicht vergessen; der Gegner selbst ist, wenngleich ohne konkrete Beweise, ins schiefe Licht geraten.

Aus der Distanz von rund 1500 Jahren betrachtet, läßt seine Verteidigung so manche Frage offen, erweist sich jedoch als recht aufschlußreich, was Charakter und Selbstverständnis des Hieronymus betrifft. Objektiv gesehen, ist Rufinus im Recht. Daß Hieronymus seit der Zeit des Traumerlebnisses pagane Literatur tatsächlich mied, belegt die *Praefatio* zum 3. Buch des Galater-Kommentars, die immerhin in die Zeit nach 385 fällt und in der er Paula und Eustochium ohne jeden äußeren Anlaß ersucht zu bezeugen, daß er seit mehr als 15 Jahren weder Vergil noch Cicero oder einen anderen heidnischen Autor gelesen habe.[40] Seine Absicht, pagane Lektüre zu meiden, war also mindest so authentisch wie sein Wille, die Jungfrauen davon abzuhalten.

Diese Tatsache unterschlägt Hieronymus in seiner Rechtfertigung, die ganz auf Nichtigkeit, Fiktionalität und Realitätsenthobenheit des Traumes aufgebaut ist, wohlweislich völlig. Er rechnet mit dem Vergessen seiner Leser, auch der Loyalität seiner engsten Vertrauten. Annähernd 17 Jahre sind seit jenem Schreiben an Eustochium vergangen, mögen auch Abschriften des Briefes im Bekanntenkreis kursiert sein — immerhin besaß Rufinus ein Exemplar —, wer mochte sich schon die Mühe machen, genau nachzulesen. Glücklicherweise hatte ja auch Rufinus nur einen Teil der Traumschilderung wörtlich und jene Sätze über die Wirklichkeitsrelevanz nur indirekt wiedergegeben.

Die unverzeihliche Schwäche der Rechtfertigung liegt darin, daß Hieronymus sich weder zu seiner ursprünglichen Absicht noch zu seiner geänderten Haltung bekennt. Zum einen versucht er zu argumentieren, daß der Entschluß zur Lektüreabstinenz nie in der Realität vorhanden und geäußert worden sei — Träume sind Schäume, für die niemand verantwortlich gemacht werden kann. Andrerseits leugnet er, seiner angeb-

lich nie besessenen Einstellung untreu geworden zu sein. Im Grunde heben sich seine beiden Hauptargumente gegenseitig auf, und nur dank seiner hervorragenden rhetorischen Taktik bleibt ein äußerer Anschein gewahrt.

Obwohl man kaum annehmen darf, daß sich Hieronymus der Schwäche seiner Argumentation voll bewußt war, sah er sich genötigt, im 3.Buch (c.32) seiner *Apologie* gegen Rufinus, als er den Wortlaut der Invektive vor Augen hatte, nochmals Stellung zu beziehen. Freilich findet sich auf den ersten Blick wenig Neues. Er betont weiterhin die Nichtigkeit des Traumes, um dann in gesteigertem Maß aggressiv gegen Rufinus vorzugehen. Ein einziges Argument verdient mehr Beachtung:

> Adv. Ruf. 3,32: *Magni criminis reus sum, si puellis et virginibus Christi dixi saeculares libros non legendos, et me in somnis commonitum promisisse ne legerem.*

Hieronymus spricht erstmals direkt die didaktische Absicht seiner Traumschilderung, ihre Exempelfunktion für die Adressatin(nen) an. R. Mollweide erklärte dazu, dies sei »die letzte authentische Interpretation des Traumgesichtes durch Hieronymus selber: daß er die klassischen Schriften nur den Frauen, namentlich den Nonnen, habe vorenthalten wissen wollen.«[41] Früher habe er sich mit Rücksicht auf Paula gescheut, den für sie demütigenden Sachverhalt darzulegen. Deshalb sei auch das 3.Buch der *Apologie* erst nach Paulas Tod (26.Jan.404) geschrieben, nicht bald nach dem 2.Buch.

Dem kann ich nur teilweise folgen. Die didaktische Absicht seiner Exempelerzählung ist richtig erkannt, doch schließt sie die Gültigkeit des Gebots für ihn selbst, wie wir gezeigt haben, keinesfalls aus. Bemerkenswert ist freilich, wie sich Hieronymus durch die Abhängigkeit des *promisisse* von *dixi* vom Authentizitätsanspruch seines Traumes distanziert: Er sagte den Frauen und Mädchen, daß er im Traum versprochen hätte ... Ob er es tatsächlich versprochen hat, bleibt klugerweise im dunklen.

Zweifelhaft ist, abgesehen von Datierungsfragen,[42] seine Rücksichtnahme auf Paula als Grund für das lange Hintanhalten dieses Arguments.[43] Vielmehr scheinen die Ursachen darin zu suchen zu sein, daß er anfangs, wie gewohnt, unmittelbar auf die aktuelle Situation reagierte: sich selber mit billigen Argumenten und viel Polemik reinzuwaschen, den anderen zu verunglimpfen. Bei der neuerlichen Aufnahme, der Anklageschrift mag ihm aufgefallen sein, auf welch tönernen Füßen

seine Verteidigung mit ihrem eklatanten Widerspruch zu den Behauptungen in epist. 22,30 stand. Die Betonung der didaktischen Komponente mag ihm als gutes Zusatzargument erschienen sein, zumal sie ja auch der Wahrheit entsprach. Völlig läßt sich der Widerspruch seiner Traumschilderung wegen ihrer Intentionsdichotomie, Didaxe und Selbstdarstellung, damit freilich auch nicht lösen. Dennoch scheinen seine Bemühungen dank seiner rhetorischen Fähigkeiten, die auch denen des Rufinus überlegen waren, soweit von Erfolg gekrönt gewesen zu sein, daß uns nichts von einer Weiterverfolgung dieser Anklage gegen ihn, von welcher Seite auch immer, bekannt ist.

Der wahre Sachverhalt — Abwendung von paganer Lektüre, Darstellung dieses Willensentschlusses mit didaktischer Intention im Traumexempel, Änderung der Haltung zugunsten einer differenzierteren Einstellung, Unsicherheit über die neuerworbene Haltung — ist Hieronymus keinen Gedanken, kein Wort und kein Argument wert. Ihm scheint allein wichtig zu sein, ein Bild in der Öffentlichkeit aufrecht zu erhalten, das von jeglichen inneren Widersprüchen frei ist.

Es war Hieronymus selten ein Anliegen, sich mit den Werten und ihrem Wandel auseinanderzusetzen, seine Einstellungsveränderungen in sein Sein und seine Persönlichkeit zu integrieren. Die *retractationes* eines Augustinus, die tiefe und kritische Auseinandersetzung mit dem Selbst im Wandel der Zeit, mochten ihm fremd gewesen sein, setzten sie doch eine Annahme der eigenen Person, auch in ihrer Schwäche, voraus.

Zu dieser Selbstakzeptanz unfähig, war Hieronymus im Grunde von der Anschuldigung des Rufinus überfordert. Seine Einstellung zur heidnischen Literatur hatte sich geändert,[44] nur hatte sich Hieronymus aufgrund seiner problematischen Persönlichkeitsstruktur darüber nie Rechenschaft abgelegt und zu einer widerspruchsfreien Haltung durchgerungen.

Die Widersprüche in Traumschilderung, tatsächlichem Verhalten und Argumentation bei der Verteidigung lassen sich somit wohl auch nicht durch eine Suche nach objektiven Gründen und Kriterien beseitigen, sondern nur im Verständnis für die spezielle psychische Situation des Hieronymus auflösen.

V.

In der abschließenden psychoanalytischen Annäherung an die Person des Hieronymus, wie sie uns aus seinen Schriften entgegentritt, wollen

wir uns der Theorie bedienen, die E. Drewermann in seinem jüngsten Werk entwirft, da sie der bislang wohl einzige Versuch ist, Wechselwirkungen zwischen Pysche und klerikaler Lebenswahl *kritisch* zu durchleuchten, ohne deshalb in antiklerikale Polemik zu verfallen.[45]

Das Psychogramm des Hieronymus, das sich aus seiner Selbstdarstellung als auserwählter Märtyrer einerseits und als Lehrer, als Stütze der orthodoxen Kirche andererseits, aus dem präsentierten Gottesbild und aus dem ungenügenden Verleugnen des eigenen »Versagens« ergibt, zeichnet einen Menschen mit unterentwickeltem Ich.[46]

Hieronymus hat sich wohl aus Angst vor den verdrängten und deformierten Es-Strebungen ins Überich geflüchtet, um der Gefahr asozialer Triebdurchbrüche zu entgehen.[47] Allerdings bleibt der Kurzschluß, ein Mensch werde wesentlich bestimmt durch die Ausrichtung seines moralischen Wollens, und damit die Verdrängung des Unbewußten nicht ohne Folgen: Der verdrängte Anteil des Unbewußten geht nicht einfach verloren, er wird vom Menschen abgezogen und auf »Gott« übertragen; die psychische Verdrängung des Unbewußten führt zur theologischen Projektion des Verdrängten in das Göttliche.[48] In der Folge zieht einerseits die Person Gottes all die Ambivalenzgefühle und Widersprüche auf sich, die unbewältigt geblieben sind, andrerseits verhindert das so entstandene Gottesbild, das nun als übermächtiges Gegenüber erscheint, durch in ihm »objektivierte« Zwänge und Schuldgefühle, eine auf Selbstvertrauen gegründete Weiterentwicklung des Ichs. Die Trennung und der Widerspruch zwischen den »Forderungen« »Gottes« und den eigenen Wünschen sind zu einem konstitutiven Teil der Psyche geworden.

So lassen sich auch viele dogmatische und insbesondere moraltheologische Positionen des Hieronymus als Rationalisierungen von Konflikten verstehen, die er mit sich selber hat. Ontische Unsicherheit, Verkommenheitsgefühle, Ängste vor Freiheit, vor dem Umgang mit dem individuellen Ich treiben zum Aufbau eines übersteigerten Überich, dessen alles bestimmendem Diktat er sein Sein unterwirft, ein Sein, das freilich in seiner verinnerlichten Form von Zwang und Außenlenkung immer mehr auf die Denkkategorien von Bewähren und Versagen reduziert wird. Den wachsenden Strafängsten kann nur mit pathologisch übersteigerten Askesebestrebungen und einer verinnerlichten Opfertheologie begegnet werden.[49]

Ein geradezu himmelschreiendes Zeugnis für die verinnerlichte hochgradige Fremdbestimmtheit und Opferhaltung legt Hieronymus in sei-

ner Traumschilderung ab. Wir haben die Selbststilisierung als Märtyrer aufgezeigt und ihre Wurzeln in der Überich-diktierten Selbstverleugnung gefunden, die als einziger Weg der Selbstvergewisserung und Selbsterhöhung verblieben ist.

Die Tatsache, daß Hieronymus nicht einmal mehr aufgrund eines persönlichen Entschlusses zur Abkehr von der paganen Literatur gelangt, oder dies zumindest so darstellt, signalisiert, wie weit das eigene Überich auf »Gott« projiziert wurde, wie absolut die Fremdbestimmung ist. Die Angst vor jeglicher Freiheit, auch und insbesondere der des Geistes,[50] treibt zur Selbstzensur, die als Gottes Wille verstanden wird. Die ideologische und moralisch verfestigte Form der angstbedingten Selbstunterdrückung und Selbstverleugnung hat ein solches Ausmaß angenommen, daß an jeder Stelle, die einen gewissen Ausweg aus der inneren Gefangenschaft in Richtung von auch nur ein wenig privater Zufriedenheit oder Genußfähigkeit zu weisen imstande wäre, Selbsteinwände auftauchen, deren Nicht-Erfüllung mit schweren Schuldgefühlen bestraft wird.

In Korresponsion damit steht das ambivalente Gottesbild, ein unerbittlich strafender Richter, der dennoch als barmherzig angesehen wird,[51] wenn er auch nie von der quälenden Spannung von Opfer und Selbstverzicht zu erlösen vermag. Allein die passivische Hoffnung auf das Mitleid anderer — in diesem Fall der Engel und der Umstehenden — entschädigt für die vollkommenen Selbstauslieferung masochistischer Opfergesinnung, wie auch die geweinten Tränen Symbol für die Erlösung von Schuldbewußtsein sind. Aus lauter Schuld und Strafangst wird »freiwillig« Verzicht geübt. Hieronymus stilisiert sich stolz als heroisches Opferlamm für Gott, das nicht nur in Demut Verzicht übt, sondern ihn auch anderen als Heil predigt — und offenbart dabei doch unendlich viel von seiner Gequältheit.

Die Belehrungsabsicht des Hieronymus, vor allem aber der auf Selbstverzicht ausgerichtete Rigorismus seiner Askese-Dogmen, bestätigt nur seine neurotisierte Persönlichkeitsstruktur. Er, der nicht zu leben weiß, kann auch andere Menschen nicht leben lassen. »Die Übererfüllung bestimmter Gruppennormen, ursprünglich aus der Angst vor Ablehnung entstanden, wird schließlich auf dem Weg eines demonstrativen Imponiergehabes zu einem Mittel der Einschüchterung anderer.«[52] Die eigene Fremdbestimmtheit wird zur Zwangsvorschrift für andere; er, der in sich selbst keinen Halt besitzt, muß sich zum ehernen Halt anderer machen, weil nur die entliehene Geltung seines Amtes, seiner Rolle

als Lehrer, ihn seiner selbst vergewissert. Die Belehrung anderer wird zur Selbstbestätigung.

Wenn Hieronymus die christlichen Frauen ermahnt, der paganen Literatur fernzubleiben, und sich selbst (!) dabei als didaktisches Exempel präsentiert, zeigt sich, wie eng Selbstdarstellung und Belehrung als Mittel der Selbstvergewisserung und Selbstbestätigung verknüpft sind: Indem er Eustochium sein Erlebnis erzählt, vergewissert er sich auch der Richtigkeit der eigenen Haltung. Zugleich aber gelingt eine Selbsterhöhung, die Sublimierung des Qual des Verzichts zugunsten des Bewußtseins, etwas Besonderes zu sein.[53]

Die Fremdbestimmtheit, die Selbstverleugnung, die Demütigungen durch Versagen und Gewissensqualen, die Selbstvernichtung, die als letzte Konsequenz vom Überich gefordert wird, alles wird mit Hilfe einer mißverstandenen christlichen Opfertheologie zum Zeichen der Auserwähltheit gemacht. Nicht ein quälender Alptraum hat Hieronymus heimgesucht, sondern Gott hat ihn für wert befunden, sich ihm zu zeigen, ihn in einer Traum-Epiphanie vor der Verdammnis zu retten. Indem Hieronymus sich selbst als leuchtendes Märtyrerexempel darbietet, gelingt es ihm, etwas von dem himmlischen Lohn, der ihm einst für seine Askese zuteil werden soll, auf Erden vorwegzunehmen: in Form von Anerkennung, Selbstzufriedenheit und wenigstens kurzfristigem Freisein von Gewissenszwängen.

Die eigene Identität kann nur über den Umweg der Totalidentifikation mit der erwählten Rolle als »Opfer« gewonnen werden. Da diese Rolle strukturell in einer einzigen Verleugnung des Subjekts besteht, entstehen in der Folge Fanatismus und Totalitätsanspruch auf Wahrheit, die keine Kritik dulden.

Der Mangel an eigener Persönlichkeit läßt auch den Mut zur eigenen Meinung schwinden. Sie wird ersetzt durch institutionalisierte Lehrsätze und Dogmen: Der Kirchenlehrer ist nicht Mensch, sondern »Amtsperson«. Als Amtsperson aber darf er niemals eingestehen, einen Irrtum begangen zu haben.[54] Wenn man sich vor Augen hält, daß Hieronymus durch die Angriffe des Rufinus einerseits einem Wiederaufflammen von Schuldgefühlen ausgeliefert war, die sein schwaches Ich vernichteten, da die schon bestehenden Überichängste nun durch das objektive, etablierte System der drohenden sozialen Strafe verstärkt wurden, und daß er andererseits als »Verteidiger der Kirche« keinen Irrtum einbekennen konnte — eine durch psychische Weiterentwicklung bedingte Meinungsänderung zuzugeben, war Hieronymus auch zu diesem Zeitpunkt nicht

in der Lage —, ist mehr als verständlich, daß seine Apologie in ihrer Argumentation an der Sache vorbeigehen und in aggressive Polemik ausarten mußte.

Somit lösen sich die objektiv existierenden Widersprüche im Verhalten auf, wenn man die subjektiven Bedingtheiten der hieronymianischen Psyche berücksichtigt: Die Zwänge des Überichs diktieren ihm aus Angst vor den nicht integrierten Es-Strebungen die Abkehr vom letzten Rest individueller Freiheit, vom ästhetischen Freiraum der paganen Literatur. Gewissensbisse und die Sehnsucht nach Übereinstimmung mit dem Gruppenverhalten treiben ihn zu einer Opferhandlung, einem Selbstopfer, im Traum, das zugleich eine Selbsterhöhung darstellt. »Gott« »erwählt« ihn und zwingt ihn, seine letzten Persönlichkeitsrest zu opfern. Die Selbststilisierung als christlicher Märtyrer ist, ungeachtet aller inhaltlicher Paradoxie und Ungereimtheit, unerläßlich, um dieses Opfer überhaupt erträglich zu machen und das vernichtete Ich-Gefühl wenigstens in der Totalidentifikation mit den Ansprüchen des Überichs wiederaufzurichten. Die didaktische Intention hilft mit; jedes Gefängnis läßt sich leichter ertragen, wenn man nicht allein darin sitzt. Erst nach Jahren ist Hieronymus soweit, die Gefängnismauern abzutragen und dahin zu kommen, eine seiner Persönlichkeit entsprechende Form des Umgangs mit der paganen Lektüre zu finden: Er vermag sie in die Ansprüche des Überichs zu integrieren. Und ausgerechnet da mußte sein Gegner Rufinus den Widerspruch zur früheren Haltung, die noch dazu mit der offiziellen Kirchenmeinung kongruent war, aufdecken! Die öffentlichen Anschuldigungen des Rufinus versetzten dem sich vorsichtig emanzipierenden Ich, das differenziertere Gewissensentscheidungen ermöglichte, einen vernichtenden Schlag. Unter der Androhung sozialer Bestrafung wiedererstarkte der selbstverleugnende Rigorismus, die Fremdbestimmtheit. Es kann für Hieronymus nicht mehr um Rechtfertigung seiner Haltung und Erörterung eines theologischen Problems gehen, sondern nur mehr um Schuld, Versagen und Selbstbestrafung — und um rollenspezifische Leugnung nach außen. Nur allzu verständlich ist da, daß die Verteidigung nur eine unreflektierte Nichtigkeitserklärung enthält, die auch das eigene Gewissen erleichtern soll, und auf die Verunglimpfung des Gegners, der nun zum »Gottesfeind« erklärt wird,[55] abzielt. Der Selbsthaß kann sich nur in Aggresion entladen.

Immerhin hat die Psyche des Hieronymus das christliche Ideal in einer spezifischen Richtung mitgeprägt,[56] die sich aufgrund der Autorität des Kirchenlehrers durchsetzte und, über Jahrhunderte tradiert, bis in die Gegenwart als wirkungsvoll erweist.[57]

ANMERKUNGEN

[1] Der Brief ist ungefähr 2 Jahre, nachdem Hieronymus von seinem Aufenthalt in der Wüste Chalkis nach Rom zurückgekommen war, im Frühjahr 384 entstanden und sollte, wohl nur vordergründig an Eustochium adressiert, den Zeitgenossen des Hieronymus zur Stärkung ihres Willens zur Keuschheit dienen und ihnen in einer Zeit, da noch kaum Regeln für ein mönchisches Leben existierten, Verhaltensregeln für ein gottgefälliges Leben an die Hand geben. N. Adkin, Some Notes on the Content of Jerome's Twenty-Second Letter.: Graz.Beitr. 15 (1988) 177-186, verdeutlicht, daß Hieronymus entgegen früherer Annahmen (Grützmacher) allgemein verbreitetes Gedankengut christlicher Kreise dieser Zeit ohne besondere erkennbare Ordnung zusammengestellt und daher kaum Anspruch auf Originalität hat.

[2] Beide Gebote sind traditionell und weitverbreitet; vgl. N. Adkin, Some Notes on the Dream of Jerome.: Philologus 128 (1984) 119-126, 119 Anm. 1. Hieronymus selbst hat ein Jahr vor epist. 22 in epist. 21,13,4ff. an Damasus zur Unvereinbarkeit von christlicher Lebensform und heidnischer Lektüre Stellung genommen und dabei von *siliquae*, von *carmina Poetarum* als *cibus Daemoniorum* gesprochen, die so behandelt werden sollten wie die gefangene Frau in Deut. 21,10-13; vgl. H. Hagendahl, Latin Fathers and the Classics. A Study on the Apologists, Jerome and Other Christian Writers. Göteborg 1985, 319f.; weitere Belege für Aussagen des Hieronymus und anderer Christen zu dieser Frage Adkin, Dream a.O. 119 Anm. 2.

[3] Einen ausführlichen Überblick der widersprüchlichen Meinungen bietet R. Eiswirth, Hieronymus' Stellung zur Literatur und Kunst. Wiesbaden 1955 (= Klass.-Philol. Studien 16), weiters Hagendahl a.o. 318-328; Adkin, Dream a.O. 120; H. Hagendahl/J. H. Waszink, Art. Hieronymus: RAC Suppl. 113 (1989) 117-139, bes. 120.

[4] Adv. Ruf. 30f., CCL 79, 29-33

[5] Apol. Hier. 2,4-13, PL 21, 586-594.

[6] Hagendahl a.O. 318f.; F. Cavallera, Saint Jérôme et son œuvre. Première partie I et II. Louvain/Paris 1922, I,2,77.

[7] M. Fuhrmann, Die Mönchsgeschichten des Hieronymus. Formexperimente in erzählender Literatur. : ders.(Hrsg.), Christianisme et formes littéraires de l'antiquité tardive en occident. Génève 1976, (= Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique 23) 41-99, erörtert, wie fließend gerade in der Legendenliteratur die Übergänge zwischen Faktizität und weltdeutender Fiktion sind und wie sehr Hieronymus doch bemüht ist, den Anschein von Authentizität seiner Heiligenviten aufrecht zu erhalten, da christliche Literatur littérature engagée zu sein hatte. Zum Fiktionsbegriff, bes. im Bereich des Religiösen H. R. Jauß, Das Vollkommene als Fascinosum des Fiktiven.: D. Henrich/W. Iser (Hrsg.), Funktionen des Fiktiven. München 1983 (= Poetik und Hermeneutik 10); M. Fuhrmann, Wunder und Wirklichkeit. Zur Siebenschläferlegende und anderen Texten aus christlicher Tradition. : Henrich a.O. 209-224; W. Pannenberg, Verdinglichung und Transfiguration.: Henrich a.O. 521-527.

[8] Vgl. Hagendahl a.O. 120, 319.

[9] Zu Fiktionalität und Authentizität der Autobiographie J. Landwehr, Text und Fiktion. Zu einigen literaturwissenschaftlichen und kommunikationstheoretischen Grundbegriffen. München 1975.

[10] Zur grundsätzlichen Klärung des hier verwendeten Fiktionalitätsbegriffs sei verwiesen auf das dynamische Modell fiktionaler Akte nach W. Iser, Akte des Fingierens. Oder: Was ist das Fiktive im fiktionalen Text? : Henrich a.O. 121-151.

[11] Hagendahl a.O. 325f.

[12] Einer den weltlichen Genüssen verschriebenen Jugend folgte die völlige Weltabkehr als Einsiedler in der Wüste Chalkis. Der Preis des Eremitenlebens (epist. 14; 17,3; 125) schlägt um in Enttäuschung über das eigene Scheitern darin und verkehrt sich in Warnungen vor den Tücken der Einsamkeit und in ein Loblied auf das (klösterliche) Gemeinschaftsleben. Seiner erleichterten Rückkehr aus Antiochien nach Rom folgt eine unfreiwillige Abreise aus diesem Sündenbabel (epist. 45). Aber auch der jubelnde Einzug ins Heilige Land (epist. 46 Paulae et Eustochi ad Marcellam) endet in Enttäuschung (epist. 114,1; 126,2). Freunde werden Feinde. Der Mönch, der sich seinen priesterlichen Aufgaben zu entziehen sucht (contra Joh. Jerosolym. 41; epist. 51), freundet sich mit dem Gedanken an, Papst zu werden (epist. 45,3). Seine langjährige und tiefe Verehrung für Origenes fällt der Angst vor einem Abweichen von der Orthodoxie zum Opfer. Und die Vertreterinnen jenes Geschlechts, vor dem er den rechtsschaffenen Christen gar nicht oft und ausführlich genug warnen kann (epist. 125,6), sind aus seinem eigenen Leben gar nicht wegzudenken; man denke nur an Paula, Marcella, Eustochium, Blesilla, Lea usw. Dazu G. Grützmacher, Hieronymus. Eine biographische Studie zur alten Kirchengeschichte. 3 Bde. Bd.1 Leipzig 1901, Bd.2 u. 3 Berlin 1906/08, Ndr. Aalen 1969, 1,225-269.

[13] Hagendahl a.O. 323, 328.

[14] Zur wertenden Reihung des Verzichts und zur Betonung des Essens vgl. Adkin, Dream a.O. 120f.

[15] Vgl. Adkin, Dream a.O. 121f. Epist. 14,2f. bestätigt die Annahme, daß Hieronymus sein Leben in der Nachfolge Christi als Kampf um die ewige Seligkeit, um das himmlische Jerusalem, betrachtet hat: *Ecce donativum, quod militaturus acceperas, hostilia castra suspirant ... Veniet, veniet postea dies, quo victor revertaris in patriam; quo per Jerosolymam coelestem vir fortis coronatus incedas.* Vgl. A. v. Harnack, Militia Christi. Die christliche Religion und der Soldatenstand in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten. Tübingen 1905, Ndr. Darmstadt 1963.

[16] Vgl. Jamini Cuesta, Pathos y dieta de S. Jeronimo. : Archivos iberoamericanos de ist. de la medicina 1 (1949) 299-366; E. Benz, Die Vision. Erfahrungsformen und Bilderwelt. Stuttgart 1969, bes. 37-63 »Vision und Askese«.

[17] Im Text ist der Richter nicht genau identifiziert, nur zweimal mit *domine* tituliert, letzteres auch im Psalm-Vers 56,2, was ebenso wie der Hinweis auf das strahlende Licht nahelegt, daß Gott oder vielmehr Jesus Christus als *kyrios* gemeint ist, und jene Stimmen widerlegt, die sich für einen mythologischen Unterweltsherren wie Rhadamantys/Minos aussprachen; vgl. J. J. Thierry, The Date of the Dream of Jerome. : Vig Christ 17 (1961) 28-40, 33; dagegen Adkin, Dream a.O. 123. Da auch Rufinus in seiner *Apologie* die dem Tribunal Angehörenden als Gott und seine Engelsschar bezeichnet und dem von Hieronymus nicht widersprochen wird, scheint diese Annahme unausweichlich. Vgl. auch Kapitel III den Vergleich mit Aug. serm. 308,5.

[18] Adkin, Dream a.O. bes. 120, 123. Hieronymus selbst lasse die der Verfolgung ausgesetzten Christen gleichfalls vor einem *tribunal iudicis* stehen (epist. 42,1; 120,9f.).

[19] Vgl. auch epist. 14,4; 22,4. E. E. Malone, The Monk and the Martyr. The Monk as Successor of the Martyr. Washington 1950 (= Studies in Christian Antiquity 12).

[20] Aug. serm. 308. PL 38, 1408-1410. M. Dulaey, Le rêve dans la vie et la pensée de S. Augustin. Paris 1973 (= Études Augustiniennes). Weitere zeitgenössische Traumschilderungen finden sich bei Sulpicius Severus, Vita S. Martini 3,2ff.; vgl. auch den Kommentar von J. Fontaine, Paris 1968 (= Sources Chrétiennes 134), 482ff.

[21] Die *sermones* des Augustinus fallen in die Zeit nach seiner Bischofsweihe um 395.

[22] Trotz der zahlreichen beinahe wörtlichen Übereinstimmungen zwischen beiden Textabschnitten, sollte man mit Cavallera a.O. II, 77f. einen literarischen Einfluß nicht annehmen, da in beiden Fällen die Erzählung ihre Wurzeln in gleichen Ursachen psychologischer und religiöser Art habe. Visionen, Träume und innere Entsprechungen spielten damals im Leben der Christen eine beachtliche Rolle; vgl. auch A. Resch, Der Traum im Heilsplan Gottes. Freiburg 1964; J. Lindblom, Gesichte und Offenbarung. Vorstellungen von göttlichen Weisungen und übernatürlichen Erscheinungen im ältesten Christentum. Lund 1968; Benz a.O.; G. Händler, Christus im Traum nach lateinischen Texten des 3. und 4. Jhts. : Theol Litztg 95 (1970) 482-490; J. S. Hanson, Dreams and Visions in the Graeco-Roman World and Early Christianity. : ANRW 2,23,2 (1980) 1395-1427. Allerdings zeigt Cavallera gerade mit seinem Hinweis auf die literarische Tradition, wie übrigens auch P. de Labriolle, Le songe de St. Jérôme. : Miscellanea Geronimiana. Roma 1920, der für die Theorie Tertullian, Irenaeus, Augustin, für die Praxis Dionysios von Alexandrien, Cyprian und Ambrosius anführt, welche Art von Authentizität man bei Hieronymus' Traumerzählung zu erwarten hat, da sie in die Reihe von Wundererzählungen, Aretalogien und erbaulicher Literatur einzureihen ist. Vgl. Hanson a.O. 1405-1405 und P. Antin, Récueil sur saint Jérôme. Bruxelles 1968 (= Collection Latomus 95), bes. 71-100, der die Vergleichsstudie bis ins Mittelalter fortsetzt. Es ist kaum mehr zu entscheiden, ob der Betreffende tatsächlich eine Vision hatte oder er diese traditionsreiche Form für seine Darstellung benutzte; vgl. W. Speyer, Die literarische Fälschung im heidnischen und christlichen Altertum. Ein Versuch ihrer Deutung. München 1971 (= Hb. d. Altertumswiss. 1,2) bes. 35-39; 50-56; 65-67. Dennoch muß im folgenden der Anspruch im Auge behalten werden, den Hieronymus stellt, wenn er sich selbst als einen jener von Gott erwählten Männer darstellt, denen eine Gottesvision zuteil wurde; vgl. epist. 114,1 an Theophilus: ... *gravissimo languore correptus, et mortis limen ingrediens, Domini misericordia et tuis precibus reservatus sum.* Zur Formulierung vgl. Apul. met. 11,21 und 23.

[23] Speyer a.O. 50-56.

[24] Vgl. Hagendahl a.O. 318f. und oben S. 1f.; weniger das Traumgeschehen selbst als die zugrundeliegende Problematik, die Erfahrung der eigenen Unzulänglichkeit und der Notwendigkeit eines unablässigen Kampfes, überwältigt Hieronymus und beeinflußt seine Darstellungsweise.

[25] Zu diesen Begriffen als Begleiterscheinungen und Charakteristika der Epiphanie vgl. E. Pax, Art. Epiphanie. : RAC 5 (1962) 832-909, bes. 833; W. Speyer, Frühes Christentum im antiken Strahlungsfeld. Tübingen 1989. (= Wiss. Untersuchungen zum NT 50) Reg. s.v. Epiphanie, Licht.

[26] Act. 9,3-9; H. Windisch, Die Christusepiphanie vor Damaskus und ihre religionsgeschichtlichen Parallelen. : ZNW 31 (1932) 1-23; Pax a.O. 869.

[27] Ebenda 869: »... sodaß nur derjenige ein wahrer Apostel ist, der den Herrn gesehen hat.«

[28] Zur Begriffsbestimmung der Epiphanie und ihrer Abgrenzung gegenüber Vision, Traum und Inkubation Pax a.O. 832f; in unserem Fall liegt eine reduzierte Form vor, da die charakteristische Einleitung mit Gruß, der Formel »Fürchte dich nicht« und der Selbstvorstellung fehlt. Da Hieronymus sich in seiner Traum-Epiphanie fürchten soll, kann in der inhaltlichen Gegebenheit der Grund für die Verformung liegen, andrerseits mag die formale Mischung mit dem Traum ausschlaggebend gewesen sein.

[29] Pax a.O. 833, 869. Die didaktische Tendenz der Erzählung ist ja Intention des Hieronymus, nicht Inhalt oder Auftrag der Traumepiphanie, also Sekundärfolge.

[30] Mit diesem Bibelzitat charakterisiert Hieronymus den Richter abermals als Jesus, denn dieser warnt Mt. 6,21 mit eben diesen Worten davor, zwei Herren dienen zu wollen.

[31] Zur Problematik des zitierten Psalmvers 6,6 Adkin, Dream a.O. 124f;

[32] Schon Grützmacher a.O. 1,145; 154, hat auf die beinahe pathologische Intensität verwiesen, mit der Hieronymus Folter und Qual beschreibt, doch scheint dies auch eine Zeittendenz gewesen zu sein, vgl. die Märtyrerakten, H. Musurillo (Hrsg.): The Acts of the Christian Martyrs. Oxfort 1972, oder Prudentius, perist.

[33] Es sei auch vermerkt, daß Jesu selbst den Schwur verboten hat, Mtt. 5,33-37, daß Hieronymus also in die Irre geht, wenn er meint, durch einen Eid die Stärke und Rechtschaffenheit seines Glaubens, sein »wahres« Christentum, zu betonen und unter Beweis zu stellen.

[34] Aug. serm. 308,5: *Caesus est tam graviter, ut in dorso evigilantis vestigia plagarum appararent.* Zum Fortleben des Motivs Antin, Recueil a.O. 77-80.

[35] Vgl. W. Speyer, Art. Fluch. : RAC 7 (1969) 1160-1287, bes. 1206, 1208, 1211.

[36] Die Vorgeschichte der erbitterten Auseinandersetzung zwischen Hieronymus und seinem ehemaligen Jugendfreund im Zusammenhang mit dem die Kirche erschütternden Origenes-Streit ist hier nicht aufzurollen. Einen Überblick über die Geschehnisse vermitteln Grützmacher a.O. 3,1ff.; P. Nautin, L'excommunication de saint Jérôme. : Annuaire de l'École pratique des Hautes études. 5. Sect. 80/81,2 (1972/74) 7-37; ders., Études de chronologie hieronymienne (393-397). : Rev Ét 18 (1972) 209-218, RE Aug 19 (1973) 69-86, 213-239, RE Aug 20 (1974) 251-284.

[37] Adv. Ruf. 1,1: *Scribuntur contra me libri, ingeruntur omnibus audiendi; et tamen non eduntur, ut et simplicium corda percutiant, et mihi facultatem pro me auferant respondendi. Novum malitiae genus, accusare, quod prodi timeas: scribere quod occultes.*

[38] Adv. Ruf. 1,3; 21.

[39] Vgl. *dormiens, somnii, vigilans, somnium, somnium, somniis, somniis, ...*

[40] In Gal. 3,1: *Nosti enim et ipsae, quod plus quam quindecim anni sunt, ex quo in manus meas nunquam Tullius, nunquam Maro, nunquam gentilium litterarum quilibet auctor ascendit: et si quid forte inde dum loquimur, obrepit, quasi antiqui per nebulam somnii recordamur.*

[41] R. Mollweide, Die Enstehung der Cicero-Exzerpte des Haoard und ihre Bedeutung für die Textkritik I: Wien Stud 33 (1911) 282ff.

[42] Vgl. Grützmacher a.O. 1,68.

[43] Immerhin war er an anderer Stelle sofort bereit, seine Wertschätzung für die Frauen an seiner Seite preiszugeben, als er angegriffen wurde; epist. 65,1: *Scio me, Principia, in Christo filia, a plerisque reprehendi, quod interdum scribam ad mulieres, et fragiliorem sexum maribus praeferam ... Si viri de Scripturis quaererent, mulieribus non loquerer.* Vgl. auch die Vorrede zum Kommentar des Propheten Zephanja (PL 25,1337). Auch war Paula kaum die einzige Adressatin.

[44] Erste Anzeichen für eine Haltungsänderung zeigen sich in den Galater-Kommentaren, doch wird die »Praxis« hier noch stark von der »Theorie« bestritten. Dagegen läßt sich in der Invektive gegen Iovinian (um 399) ein radikaler Wandel feststellen, der in den positiven Aussagen zu heidnischer Literatur in epist. 70 (um 397) einen vorläufigen Höhepunkt erreicht hat. Der Mangel an Ich-Stärke und selbstverantwortlicher Entscheidungskraft lassen freilich noch immer Zweifel stark werden, so etwa epist. 70,3,2, und seine Argumentation gegen Rufin sogleich wieder in alte Bahnen gleiten.

[45] E. Drewermann, Kleriker. Psychogramm eines Ideals. Olten/Freiburg i.B. 1989, hat die psychischen Voraussetzungen für eine Lebenswahl als Kleriker aufgearbeitet. Ohne

mit seinen oft recht flüchtigen Thesen und seiner Verallgemeinerungstendenz im einzelnen übereinstimmen zu können, sei doch angemerkt, daß seine Strukturbeobachtungen und sein Begriffsinventar wertvolles Material und Werkzeug für eine Durchleuchtung der hieronymianischen Psyche — in aller gebotenen Vorsicht — bieten. Obwohl erstaunlich viele Erkenntnisse Drewermanns unmittelbar auf Hieronymus, der doch in einer noch relativ wenig institutionalisierten Frühphase des Klerus lebte, übertragbar wären, und es von Interesse wäre, die Biographie des Hieronymus einmal unter diesem Gesichtspunkt zu durchleuchten, sollen vorerst nur Thesenmaterial und psychoanalytisches Begriffsinventar von Drewermann übernommen werden. Ansonsten werden, um Trugschlüsse und Überinterpretation zu vermeiden, nicht neuzeitliche Erkenntnisse einem antiken Text aufgepfropft, sondern es wird der umgekehrte Weg beschritten: die aus den vorliegenden Texten erarbeiteten Fakten sollen mit Hilfe Drewermann' schen Vokabulars in eine psychologische Interpretation überführt werden.

[46] Drewermann konstatiert eine ontische Unsicherheit und prinzipielle Unberechtigtheit des Daseins, deren Ursachen in der frühesten Kindheit zu suchen sind und von ihm in spezifischen Familienkonstellationen gefunden werden, S. 269-340, und Wiedergutmachungstendenzen aller Art als Kompensationsmechanismen. Auf diese Weise wird sowohl ein Verständnis der Opferideologie bei den Klerikern sowie der eigentümlichen Vermischungen und Aufspaltung zwischen Person und Amt erreicht. Das Gefühl der Überverantwortung nebst den entsprechenden Retterphantasien, die bedingungslose Bereitschaft des Ichs zur Totalidentifikation mit den Inhalten des Überichs, die narzistisch gepflegte Position der Ausnahme aufgrund einer besonderen Erwähltheit, die Verdrängung ganzer Teile der eigenen Psyche mitsamt den Erinnerungen an die ursprüngliche Familiensituation sowie deren Ersetzung und Überhöhung durch ein »göttliches Schicksal« von Berufung und Vorsehung und nicht zuletzt die Neigung, sich die Güte und Werthaftigkeit an anderen zu beweisen, lassen sich als Reflexe eines gestörten kindlichen Ichs erkennen, wie auch das Bedürfnis nach den erlösenden Verheißungen der Religion vor diesem Hintergrund verständlich wird.

[47] So wenig Hieronymus auch über seine Kindheit und früheste Jugend berichtet, (dazu Grützmacher a.O. 1,103-113, dort auch Angaben der Selbstaussagen des Hieronymus), wird doch deutlich, daß er unter der Familiensituation, unter der Abwesenheit der Mutter, gelitten hat. Seine Betreuung durch Sklaven mag er als zusätzliche Strafe der Mutter empfunden haben, die ihm »schmutzige« Erfahrungen aufnötigte; vgl. epist. 107,11; 128,4; 130,13. Um sich vom tierhaften Verhalten der Sklaven abzuheben, dazu Drewermann a.O. 58f., ist der *timor Christi* notwendig und hilfreich. Ohne die Erfahrung mütterlicher Liebe ist Hieronymus nicht mehr fähig, Sexualität als integrierte Qualität menschlichen Seins zu erfahren; er vermag sich nur mehr als beschmutzt und verkommen zu empfinden; vgl. epist. 2; 3,1; 4,2; 7,4 und diese Minderwertigkeit durch asketische Enthaltsamkeitsgebote zu kompensieren. Vgl. Drewermann a.O. 480-654: »Keuschheit« und »Ehelosigkeit« oder: Konflikte der ödipalen Sexualität.

[48] Drewermann a.O. bes. 53f.

[49] Ebenda 280: »Die archetypischen Vorstellungsschemata von Opfer und Wiedergutmachung nebst den zugehörigen Gefühlsambivalenzen sind in der christlichen Theologie derart bestimmend geworden, daß sie als ihre Repräsentanten ... bevorzugt Menschen zulassen, deren Psyche zutiefst in der frühkindlichen Erfahrung traumatischer Ambivalenzgefühle im Umkreis grausamer Opfervorstellungen und Wiedergutmachungsverpflichtungen geprägt worden ist.«, weiters 280-286; 87-93; 185. Gerade da sich der Weg

des Mönchsseins, der einzige hochmotivierte und hochkompensierte Weg einer Bestätigung durch die Rolle, frustrierend gestaltet, beginnt die Dekompensation der hochgeschraubten Idealbildung, beginnt ein Leben im psychischen Souterrain mit der Ausbreitung heimlicher Laster und masochistischer Selbstbestrafung.

[50] Drewermann a.O. 452.

[51] Vgl. epist. 114,1: ... *gravissimo languore correptus et mortis limen ingrediens, Domini misericordia et tuis precibus reservatus sum.* Drewermann a.O. 87: »Ein Stück tiefer findet man ... mit Regelmäßigkeit eine extrem grausame Gottesvorstellung, in scheinbarem Gegensatz zu dem verbalen Bekenntnis vom liebenden und vergebenden Gott.«

[52] Drewermann a.O. 70f.

[53] Ebenda a.O. 58, 60, 69.

[54] Ebenda 114: »Hier geht es uns nur um die Feststellung, daß das beamtete Überichdenken der Kleriker wesentlich die Form eines bedingungslosen Rechtfertigungsdenken annimmt, d.h. mit einem unvermeidlichen Zwang zu Ideologiebildungen aller Art verbunden ist, und daß ein erheblicher Teil klerikaler Intelligenz eben deswegen zum Zwecke kirchlicher Apologetik verwendet werden muß.«

[55] W. Speyer, Art. Gottesfeind.: RAC 11 (1981) 996-1043.

[56] Zur Zeit des Hieronymus stand noch keineswegs fest, daß die asketische Richtung innerhalb der christlichen Lebensform zu einer so starken und dominanten Strömung anwachsen sollte. Es gab recht heftige Gegenstimmen, die auch das Klosterleben als dem Christentum im Grunde fremde Weltflucht ablehnten und an der Vertreibung des Hieronymus aus Rom aus eben diesen Gründen beteiligt waren. Dennoch zeigt sich, daß gerade Hieronymus es war, der Klosterleben und Askeseideal in Rom heimisch machte und somit die Entwicklung der Westkirche entscheidend mitbestimmte. K. S. Frank (Hrsg.): Askese und Mönchtum in der Alten Kirche. Darmstadt 1975 (= WdF 409); L. Gutierrez, St. Jerome and Roman Monasticism. A Historical Study on His Spiritual Influence. : Philippiniana Sacra 10 (1975) 256-305; Joh. B. Bauer, All origine dell' ascetismo cristiano. Brescia 1983.

[57] Drewermann a.O. 472-480.

Universität Salzburg, Residenzplatz 1, *Salzburg*

Vigiliae Christianae 45 (1991), 78-103, E. J. Brill, Leiden

REVIEWS

Bentley Layton, *Nag Hammadi Codex II*, 2-7, I, ix + 336 pages, II, ix + 281 pages, $160, not separately available. Leiden, Brill, 1989.

These books contain the Coptic text and the English translation of the following writings: the *Gospel according to Thomas*, the *Gospel according to Philip*, the *Hypostasis of the Archons, On the Origin of the World*, the *Expository Treatise on the Soul* and the *Book of Thomas the Athlete* (= the Ascetic).

The editor, Bentley Layton of Yale University, tells in the preface how a collection of his irreplaceable notes were in a lot stranded in Nicosia at the outbreak of the Turkish-Greek Cypriot War of 1974. The case containing them had to be abandoned in the downtown home of an Armenian travel agent, which unexpectedly fell within no man's land between the opposing forces. It was later rescued and transported to Cairo through the personal intervention of the commanding officer of the United Forces, who dispatched an officer to lead a neutral convoy to the building and fetch the notes. These codices seem to be doomed: again and again a war breaks out when they are about to be published.

Layton also discusses the patron of the Codex and launches the plausible theory that its Greek archetype was composed by a Valentinian. It is true that it contained one originally Valentinian work, the *Gospel according to Philip*, but this closely parallels the *Gospel according to Thomas*, suggesting the attractiveness of "Thomas", and the Jude Thomas tradition, to Valentinian Gnosticism. Moreover, to a Valentinian reader the myths of the *Apocryphon of John* and the *Hypostasis of the Archons*, though "Sethian" (= originating in the very special sect of the Gnostikoi) would have seemed familiar. The *Expository Treatise on the Soul*, though perhaps not Gnostic at all (hear! hear!), would surely bear a Valentinian reading in the light of the Valentinian sacrament of the bridal chamber. I add that the *Gospel of Philip* was probably written in the first half of the third century in Antioch. There Axionicus was according to Tertullian (*Adversus Valentinianos* IV) the only one who had preserved the original doctrine of the Master. Axionicus could be the author of the *Gospel of Philip*.

The Coptic of Codex II appears to consist of a random mixture of

forms from the Sahidic and Subachmimic dialects. In the British Library, fragments were identified of the book *On the Origin of the World* (also contained in Codex II) which were written in pure Subachmimic, and that seems to be the original version. Subachmimic, the dialect of Assiout or Lykopolis, was generally used for writings of doubtful orthodoxy. Layton suggests that the scribe of Codex II attempted artificially to conform to Sahidic, the orthodox dialect of the Nile Valley and monasticism, in order to mask its affiliation with the Valentinian heresy and make its texts more accessible to the (Catholic) reading public.

The presentation of these volumes is magnificent. This time there are, as far as I can see, no omissions in the transcription of the Coptic, no misprints, no transgressions against grammatical rules and the accentuation of the Greek language. Layton has constituted the Coptic text with the greatest caution. This text would seem to be definitive. This may even be the case with the frankly Subachmimic British Library fragments rediscovered by Dr. Christian Oeyen and here reconstructed carefully.

The introductions to the several writings are apodictic. There is no commentary, not even in the form of a volume of notes, as was the case in the Claremont edition of the Jung Codex, here called Codex I. The "Aryan World Saviour", once a stock theme of some of the authors, is nowhere mentioned any more. Stephen Emmel made excellent indices.

The translations were made by different experts and are said to replace in part provisional versions published in *The Nag Hammadi Library in English* and now to represent the final and definitive wishes of their respective translators. Generally speaking they are much too free. In some cases they are anachronistic: the nervous system had not yet been discovered at the time these writings originated. Sometimes they are completely faulty. A random choice of a few examples may prove this to be the case:

1) Logion 61 of the *Gospel of Thomas* literally runs as follows: Two will rest on a bed: the one will die, *the one* will live. This is a parallel to Luke 17.34: ὁ εἷς παραλημφθήσεται καὶ ὁ ἕτερος ἀφεθήσεται. It presupposes the Aramaic חַד וְחַד (one ... and one). The same idiomatic expression is found in the (Jewish Christian) addition to Matthew 24.11 in the Codex Bezae: εἷς ...καὶ εἷς This is supported by the Old Latin a b c d ff²q. It is misleading to blur out the Aramaic background by translating: the

one will die and the *other* will live. The reader should be enabled to discover for himself that the Western Text of the New Testament was influenced by an Aramaic Gospel tradition in part preserved by the Gospel of Thomas.

2) "The Pharisees and the Scribes have *received* the keys of Knowledge, they have hidden them." (*Gospel of Thomas* 39). This Saying, which must have been transmitted by a Jewish Christian source, can be paralleled almost word for word by many passages in the Pseudo Clementine writings: *Hom.* III, 8, 3; *Hom.* XVIII, 5, 7; *Rec.* 1, 54, 6-7; *Rec.* II 30, 1; *Rec.* II, 46, 3 (all three Greek and Syriac). And there the right interpretation of Jesus' words can be found: the Pharisees have received the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, namely the oral tradition or Mishna given by Moses, which offers the Knowledge or correct interpretation of the written Thora. The Jewish Christians, and perhaps Jesus himself, acknowledged the authoritative exegesis of the Pharisees, who were sitting on Moses' cathedra. The Coptic reading ⲁⲩϫⲓ (ἔλαβον, they received) reflects this view. The translation: «The pharisees and the scribes have *taken* the keys of knowledge» presupposes Coptic ⲁⲩϥⲓ (which is not there) and then of necessity must be an echo of Luke 11.52 (ἤρατε, have taken away).

3) Valentinian Gnosis was a religion of Grace (Gnadenreligion). But according to the Valentinians Grace had a different meaning for them than for the simple believer. For the gnostic, Grace was an inner experience of enlightenment, for the «*psychikoi*» it was no more than the forgiveness of sins proclaimed by a priest after confession. They had acquired *Grace* as a private property (ἰδιόκτητον τὴν χάριν): Catholics had Grace only on loan (ἐν χρήσει) (Iren. 1, 6, 4). Accordingly the (Valentinian) *Epistula Jacobi Apocrypha* (11, 14-17) of the Jung Codex declares: «Blessed shall they be who have spoken openly and have acquired *Grace.*» Therefore the Valentinian Gospel of Philip (76, 26-27) should be translated as follows: «There is no other way for a person to acquire this *Grace* (χάρις) except by putting on the perfect light.» «To acquire this *quality*» is not idiomatic. And can χάρις ever mean «quality» in Greek?

4) The children the woman bears resemble the man *whom she loves* (Gospel of Philip 72, 14). The woman (ⲧⲥϩⲓⲙⲉ), fem., is subject, ⲙⲙⲟϥ, (masc.), is object. The translation «resemble the man *who* loves her» must be a slip of the pen.

All this is rather serious. It does mean that this edition cannot be used

for scholarly purposes by persons with only a reading knowledge of Coptic. The Quebec translations in French use to be better.

Harold W. Attridge has recollated *P. Oxy.* 1 (now in the Bodleian Library, Oxford), *P. Oxy.* 654 (in the British Library) and *P. Oxy.* 655 (Houghton Library, Harvard) and translated them to the best of his abilities. In an introduction he emphatically denies that it was possible to identify these fragments as belonging to the *Gospel of Thomas* until the discovery of a complete text in Coptic. This simply is not true. Already in 1909 the Lutheran clergyman J.H.A. Michelsen identified them as belonging to the *Gospel of Thomas* (*T.T.T.* 7, 1909, 214-233).

My copy of *New Sayings of Jesus* etc. was published in 1904, not in 1897, as Attridge opines.

Among the testimonia there are some remarkable omissions:

1) Logion 2 ("Let him who seeks, not cease seeking" etc.) is quoted verbatim by Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis* II, IX, 45, 4-5). It is an amplification of a Saying in the *Gospel of the Hebrews*: ὁ θαυμάσας βασιλεύσει καὶ ὁ βασιλεύσας ἀναπαήσεται. Clement says: ἐπαναπαήσεται, thus proving that he quotes the *Gospel of Thomas* and not the *Gospel of the Hebrews*. It is rather silly to say that Marcovich was the first to launch this conjecture. The Hellenistic style figure of *concatenatio*, characteristic of Greek Thomas and Clement of Alexandria, is also characteristic of *Corpus Hermeticum* XIV, 4.

2) The New Testament manuscript 1006 transmits that the Pericope Adulterae (John 8.1-11) was also contained in the *Gospel of Thomas*. U. Becker, *Jesus und die Ehebrecherin*, Berlin, 1963, 145 showed this tradition to be trustworthy. It was also contained in the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, in a non-canonical form. A later Encratite may have omitted it from the Coptic copy or its hyparchetype, because he knew of no forgiveness for adultery.

3) A funerary bandage in the estate of H.-Ch. Puech, found at Oxyrrhynchus, contains the following inscription: λέγει Ἰησοῦς· οὐκ ἐστὶν τεθαμμένον ὃ οὐκ ἐγερθήσεται (*R.H.R.* CLXVII, 1955, 126-129). This is exactly how the text was restituted by Grenfell and Hunt. This testimonium shows that the *Gospel of Thomas* was still read in the Vth or VIth century in Catholic Oxyrrhynchus. In its original form it taught the resurrection of the flesh and cannot possibly be Gnostic, as so many scholars believe even today.

4) Logion 27 is virtually identical in Greek and Coptic:" Jesus said: If you fast not the world, you will not find the Kingdom."

Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* III, XV, 99, 4) again quotes the *Gospel of Thomas*, but has made the text better Greek: τοῦ κόσμου νηστεύοντες instead of ἐὰν μὴ νηστεύσητε τὸν κόσμον. Antoine Guillaumont has shown that the Greek of Thomas reflects the Aramaic and found the same expression in *Liber Graduum* XXIX, 6. All conjectures mentioned by Attridge are mistaken.

Many scholars will be eager to known what is the standpoint of Harvard New Testament professor Helmut Koester at the moment. After the first publication of the Coptic *Gospel of Thomas* in 1956 he opposed the view that the newly found writing contained in part an independent tradition of Our Lord's Sayings. At that time, he could be very incensed, when a true believer held that this apocryphon confirmed the trustworthiness of the ecclesiastical Gospels. And a colleague, who dared to say that the *Hymn of the Pearl* in the *Acts of Thomas* was not Iranian and Gnostic, but a Jewish-Christian midrash on the *Parable of the Pearl* in the *G Th*, was anathema. That was at the time that Grant, Gärtner, Haenchen, Schippers, Schrage unanimously argued that the *Gospel of Thomas* was a Gnostic perversion of Holy Writ, and were tremendously applauded by the Protestant establishment. In 1964-1965 he switched over to the other extreme. Not only the *Gospel of Thomas*, but also the *Dialogue of the Saviour* and the *Apocryphal Letter of James* were very early, completely independent and showed how Gnostic tradition had been attributed to Jesus almost from the very beginning.

Moreover Koester announced through written word, press and television his world-shaking discovery that Judas Thomas, the author of the new gospel, was a historical figure, none else than Jude, the twin brother of Jesus.

None of these extravaganzas can be found in this new book.

He now says only that the *name* of the author, Didymus Judas Thomas, allegedly the brother of Jesus and James with the Aramaic surname "the twin", which is attested exclusively in the tradition of the Syrian (= Aramaic) church, is possibly older than the references to Thomas in the Synoptic gospels and John, and does not presuppose a knowledge of the New Testament, but rests upon an independent tradition.

Koester has also abandoned his earlier view that *G Th* is Gnostic. It is now said to represent the genre called the sayings collection and to have its closest parallels in the Jewish Wisdom books (I add that

gnomologies, like the sentences of Sextus and Pseudo-Phocylides, are typically Hellenistic). Following Henri-Charles Puech K. holds that *G Th* probably was written in Edessa, (modern Urfa, Turkey), in the kingdom of Osrhoëne in northern Mesopotamia, which was an important center of Early Christianity.

The Syrian (= East Aramaic) origin of this writing is said not to imply that its original language was Syriac or (West) Aramaic (I agree). Bilingual environments such as Antioch (for the synoptic sayings source [Q]) and Edessa were, according to Koester, probably the places where the earliest Christian writings in Greek were produced. This suggests to him a date well before Justin (± 160), possibly even in the first century A.D.

Without acknowledgement, Koester accepts and develops the well-known thesis of Joachim Jeremias on the parables in *G Th*: "a comparison with the Synoptic parallels demonstrates that the forms of the sayings in the *G Th* are either more original than they or developed from forms which are more original. The biographical framework of Matthew, Mark and Luke and their editorial changes are not reflected in the *G Th*."

Then he relates his own discovery: "The sayings about the future coming of the Son of Man which Q seems to have added to the older tradition of the sayings of Jesus, are missing. They derive from a stage of the developing sayings tradition which is more original than Q. This implies that also some of those sayings in the *G Th* which have no parallels in the Synoptic gospels could derive from the earliest stage of the tradition of sayings". This earliest stage, of course, is Jesus himself. According to me, this proves that not only the new parables (1.97: the woman carrying a jar; 1.98: the man who wishes to kill a tyrant) but also all canonical parables paralleled by "Thomas" and so all canonical parables as such are definitely authentic. The *Gospel of Thomas* confirms the trustworthiness of our Bible. Koester ruefully admits that logion 22 ("When you make the two one etc.") can be paralleled from the (Enkratite) *Gospel according to the Egyptians* (i.e. the special Gospel for the Coptic Christians in Alexandria, as opposed to the Jewish (Hebrew) Christians there). Moreover, he has to confess that logion 2 ("Let him who seeks not cease seeking until he finds etc.") is also attested for the Jewish Christian, Alexandrian *Gospel according to the Hebrews*. Everybody else would consider the possibility that these two apocryphal writings were sources of *G Th*. But Koester knows better.

He simply ignores the many important parallels with *G Th* in the Jewish Christian sources of the Pseudo-Clementine writings. He does not mention the many doublets in *G Th* which prove without any shadow of a doubt that two *written* sources were used, as was the case with Matthew and Luke (Q + Mark). Thus he can declare that no early Christian writings were used in *G Th*. He *knows* that "the free tradition of sayings apparently influenced several gospels circulating during the second century".

I am not so sure that some of these sayings do not presuppose the canonical gospels. In logion 43 the word "Jew" is used with specific connotations, "you have become as the Jews". Long ago, Raymon Brown had established that this is very characteristic of the Fourth Gospel. This does not mean that the author of *G Th* used this as a source. On the contrary, like the Pseudo-Clementines and the Jewish Christian Gospels, he most decidedly did not. But he can have used a tradition and a source which was familiar with "the spiritual gospel". In that case "Thomas" would be posterior to "John", later than 100 A.D.

Moreover the fingerprints of Luke are not completely absent: ἡ βασ[ιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ] ἐντὸς ὑμῶν [ἐσ]τι, logion 3 Greek (cf. Luke 17:20-21). A more primitive doublet of the same saying is transmitted by logion 113: "the Kingdom of the Father is spread out upon the earth". Luke's words: ἐντὸς ὑμῶν transpire to be clearly redactional and reveal the spiritualising mood of Luke the Hellenist: "the Kingdom of God is within you". "Thomas" can have found it only in Luke and must be later. Therefore an early, first century date of *G Th* is simply out of the question.

Koester observes that the *Gospel of Thomas* reflects the faith of a congregation which acknowledged the primateship of James the righteous, the brother of Jesus, "for whose sake heaven and earth came into being" (1.12: a very Judaic expression). James's authority, however, is said to have been superseded by that of Thomas, who is entrusted with the secret tradition. At the same time, Thomas' authority is contrasted with that of Peter and that of Matthew in order to safeguard the special form of the tradition of churches which looked back to Thomas as their founder and as the guarantor of their faith.

A historian of the Early Church can be more specific about this state of affairs, which reflects the special relationship of Edessa with Jerusalem and its rivalry with Gentile Christian Antioch.

James was the primate of the whole Church, centered in Jerusalem. Peter (who triumphed in Antioch over Paul) was said to be the first bishop of that city. The Gospel of Matthew celebrates Peter and is held to have originated in Antioch.

The followers of James, Judaic Christians in Palestine, had a semitic conception of succession, like that practised for the "prince of the exile" of later Jews and the Imams of Islam: Jesus was succeeded by his brother and later by other relatives on the see of Jerusalem. The Pastoral Letters of "Paul" reveal that in the diaspora there were Jewish Christians, who forbade marriage and taught to abstain from certain food (meat) and wine. They were Enkratites, who long remained within the Church and in Edessa were never excommunicated.

They must have been Hellenised and had affinities with the views of Philo and other Alexandrians on the singleness of mind. They are responsible for the apocryphal *Acts of Paul, Peter and Andrew*, who all preach abstinence and divorce, and especially for writings from Edessa, the *Gospel of Thomas* (± 140), the *Book of Thomas the Athlete* (= Ascetic) (± 200) and the *Acts of Thomas* (± 225). They too acknowledge a monarchic principle of succession: the guarantor of their special tradition was Jehuda, the brother of Jesus, James, Joses and Simeon (Mark 6, 3; Matthew 13, 55 v.l.). In an unedited fragment of the *Acts of Paul* (Schneemelcher[3], 242) "Paul" is quoted as having said that it was in Damascus that he had been received into the Christian Church by the blessed Jude, the brother of the Lord, who had bestowed upon him from the very beginning the high love of the faith. Jude is described here as the legitimate successor of the Lord, who guarantees the gospel of celibacy and divorce which is the kerygma of the *Acts of Paul*. The alleged activity of Jude in Damascus of course is a pious and tendentious fiction without any historical value. Jesus had no twin.

According to Koester, only a very few sayings reflect more elaborate mythical speculation. Elements of Gnostic theology are said to be present in such passages. But a specific gnostic group is not identified. "Je voyais l'ombre d'un cocher qui avec l'ombre d'une brosse nettoyait l'ombre d'une carosse." The source of these Gnostic elements can easily be indicated, if logion 67 is translated correctly. In the first edition of The Nag Hammadi Library in English, this ran as follows: "Whosoever *believes* that the All itself is deficient, is (himself) completely deficient". There is nothing about belief in the Coptic text. The revised translation in this book has moralistic overtones: "If one who knows the all, still

feels a personal deficiency, he is completely deficient". There is nothing about personal feeling in the Coptic text. A more complete version of this saying is contained in the *Book of Thomas the Ascetic* (138, 16-18): "He who has not known himself, has known nothing, but he who has known himself, has also known the depth of the All".

This parallel shows that we should translate: "Whoever knows everything, but fails to know himself, fails to know the All". It then transpires that the passages in the *Gospel* of Thomas and the *Book* of Thomas are both amplifications of a Saying of Hermes Trismegistos. The latter is contained in the *Definitions of Hermes Trismegistos to Asklepios*, published in Armenian (Mahé, *Hermes en Haute-Egypte* II, 393) and recently discovered in Greek: "Who reflects upon himself with spiritual insight, knows himself and *whosoever knows himself, knows the All*".

This sentence contains the perennial philosophy of Gnosis in Antiquity, the Middle Ages and modern times until the present day. The redactor of *G Th* must have picked it up from the above mentioned Hermetic sayings source or a similar Hermetic writing. There is no evidence whatsoever that there were other Gnostic groups in Edessa in the second century. Not even the Marcionites can be shown to have been there at that time. But it is plausible that the Hermetic saying, which lies at the basis of the Poimandres (1st century), was known in the Athens of the East.

The author of "Thomas" obviously also had in mind the well-known fragment 16 of Heraclitus, to the effect that polymathiè, great learning in many fields, does not impart the right insight. That fragment was popular in certain circles in the second century: "There are some, my son Rheginus, who wish to learn many things. But I do not think that they took their stand within the word of the truth" (Valentinus, *Epistula ad Rheginum de resurrectione* 43, 25-34). He has combined this idea with the saying he found in his Hermetic collection of sayings. He thus reveals the source of the gnosticising elements in his writing: it is the Hermetic Gnosis.

This result of our research enables us to distinguish the different layers in the *Gospel of Thomas*:

1) a written Judaic Christian source which may or may not have been a collection of sayings, postulated by Koester, but not attested anywhere. It may also have been a Gospel which had integrated this very archaic material. It could even have been a primitive version of Mat-

thew's Gospel, as postulated by William Peterson for the *Diatessaron*. This Judaic Christian writing certainly was not encratite: in logion 55 Jesus orders his followers to "hate", that is not to give priority to the family they come from. He is decidedly not quoted as having said that they should hate or leave their wife and children.

2) a written encratite source which may or may not have been the *Gospel according to the Egyptians*. This source agreed completely with the views of Julius Cassianus and other Alexandrian Encratites, which have been preserved in the third book of the *Stromateis*. This source was familiar with the first mentioned source and reworked it to add an encrative flavour to it.

In logion 101, the doublet of l. 55, Jesus is supposed to have said, according to a plausible emendation, that our earthly mother gave us death, whereas our true spiritual mother, the Holy Spirit, gave us life. The idea that birth leads to death is Hellenic ever since Heraclitus and is attested for the Alexandrian Encratites, who called children "fodder for death".

3) the author and redactor of *G Th*, who certainly lived in Edessa, was familiar with Hermetic lore and is responsible for the "Indian" colouring of some sayings which appeals so strongly to the modern mind.

In other words, the *Gospel of Thomas*, like the *Acts of Andrew*, is an encratite writing of the second century with some Gnostic elements.

Whosoever wants to interpret the *Gospel of Thomas* cannot limit himself to form critical analysis, but must also apply the methods of source criticism and at the same time have a thorough knowledge of the Coptic language and the Hellenistic religious scene.

This is my last word on the *Gospel of Thomas*.

3722 BR *Bilthoven*, Noordhoudringelaan 32 GILLES QUISPEL

B. R. Rees, *Pelagius. A Reluctant Heretic*. Woodbridge, The Boydell Press, 1988. XV, 176 p.

Aut ego non intellego quid dicat aut ipse (*nat. et gr.* 47.55): thus once Augustine with feigned or real exasperation in his debate with Pelagius' views of 'nature'. Stripped of its sarcasm, the remark could be applied to a large part of the never ending discussion, both in the days of Pelagius and his direct adherents—if that term may indeed be used—

and afterwards in theological polemics throughout the ages until the present day. The first difficulty consists in ascertaining the precise contents of the convictions of the individual Pelagianists. The ascription of the writings in the Pelagian corpus to their respective authors is still disputed, although a certain level of an at least practical communis opinio seems to have been reached. Then there is the fact that Augustine so completely dominated the discussion that it requires some strenuous analyzing to get a view of the controversial questions from another angle.

In our century Pelagius has not been wronged by any lack of scholarly attention. Souter, De Plinval, Bonner, Brown, to name but a few, have considerably furthered the understanding of the aims and methods of his movement. Thorough surveys of the field are now available in Wermelinger's *Rom und Pelagius* (1975) and the lemma 'Pélage et Pélagianisme' by Nuvolone and Solignac in DSp XII 2889-2942 (1986). A more recent review of Pelagian studies by Wermelinger can be found in Cassiciacum XXXIX/1 (Würzburg 1989, see this journal vol. 44.311).

The intentions of the author of the book under review are somewhat difficult to grasp. In the preface he announces "an up-to-date account" and without doubt his handling of the facts is up to scholarly standards. In the course of the book, however, the account is often transformed into a plea for the defendant. This is closely bound up with another important, even dominant aspect of the book. Dr. Rees, who is a professor emeritus of Classics, is also "an amateur theologian" (72) and he is earnestly bent on coming to terms in a modern way with the central subjects of the controversy, nature, grace, and above all original sin and predestination. This personal involvement is conspicious in the fourth chapter ("Peculiar Grace"), which deals with the subjects just mentioned, but it is never absent from the text, manifesting itself i.a. in R.'s predilection for colourful phrases, pithy sayings and decorous quotations from polite literature.

R. has much sympathy for John Cassian's Semi-Pelagianism, "a *media via* between the two main protagonists in the Pelagian controversy" (96), which was unacceptable to orthodoxy, but "remained on the agenda, a thorn in the flesh of the establishment" (96). According to R., who avows his debt to Brown's studies of this aspect of the matter, the contemporary establishment has brought about the downfall of Pelagianism, because it was regarded "as a potentially dangerous

source of schism in the body social and politic" (20). The risks inherent in nonconformism had been shown by the terrible demise of Priscillian. "Heresy was now a crime against the State as well as a sin against the Church" (26). R. is certainly not a rabid admirer of Pelagius—more than once the flaws in his 'system' are revealed, e.g. his failure to explain infant baptism in a satisfactory manner (79)—, but he strongly deplores that all that was salutary in Pelagianism has been suppressed by the official Church. It "continued to exercise a strong appeal" (123), however, when "marching on" (the title of the 6th chapter). Nevertheless, we are still left with Augustine's doctrine of original sin, which R. regards as both untenable "in the light of contemporary science and philosophy" (73) and not liable to receive any well-intentioned symbolic interpretation. He feels more at home with Theissen's evolutionary approach of faith, in which the renewal by the Holy Spirit is explained in a manner which is acceptable to modern believers.

As may have become clear in these brief impressions, this book provides a personal, on a few pages even an emotional, account of the subject. The author is deeply interested "in the issues which were raised" (132). Those who share this interest, will do well to turn to his book, which in any case provides a good survey in the English language, which is quite helpful, not least by the well-ordered material in the appendices and indices.

2353 BM *Leiderdorp*, van Effendreef 15 J. DEN BOEFT

A. Kurmann, *Gregor von Nazianz, Oratio 4 gegen Julian. Ein Kommentar* (Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswisschenschaft. Heft 19). Basle, Friedrich Reinhardt Verlag, 1988. 421 pages.

Τῶν λόγων ἡμᾶς ἀπήλασεν (*Or.* 4.5): without belittling the other aspects of Gregory of Nazianzus' fierce posthumous attack on Julian the Apostate one could reasonably argue that the emperor's attempt to isolate the Christians in cultural respect roused the author's most intense irritation. His attention to the material and physical dangers which Julian's policies had in store for Christians in general and indeed individually is, quite rightly for that matter, ample and thorough. Nevertheless, to be excluded from the literary traditions of Greece was unbearable for the author of the στηλογραφία, "Aufschrift am Schand-

pfahl'' (19), as he ventured to call his invective. He dwells at length on the subject in sections 100 sqq. of the fourth 'oration', but the whole of this well contrived piece of rhetoric means to show what a Christian could offer: wide encyclopedic learning, brilliant stylistic fireworks, clever arguing.

Such a tour de force entails not a few difficulties for the modern student. Gregory's *dictionis argutia et rerum sublimitas* even overawed Erasmus (Allen 2493, 98). Fortunately J. Bernardi's edition of *Or.* 4 and 5 (Sources Chrétiennes 309, Paris 1983) provided much help, but the scope of the series made it impossible to elucidate all details. Kurmann now supplies a further ''philologische und historische Lesehilfe'' (6). He advocates a date of writing shortly after Julian's death in june 363, an opinion which is generally held today and which tallies quite well with the overall impression made by the text itself. K.'s help is varied: he does not shun small linguistic details, especially when these are essential for the correct constitution of the text and its punctuation, but he also introduces the reader in the vast domains of learning from which Gregory was drawing. Bernardi's endeavours are at times criticized rather severely, although never in an ungracious manner, and in most cases there is an undeniable improvement.

The introduction (5-36) deals with such subjects as date, structure, character, text of the 4th oration. Its 124 sections are elucidated in the large commentary proper (37-418), the contents of which are both admirable and helpful. K.'s notes contain a wealth of primary and secundary material, in which few faults or omissions can be detected. Some 'minuta': p. 104: it would seem that καθαραὶ ... χεῖρες (§ 29) instead of expressing ''rituelle Reinheit'' refers to moral purity; p. 125: a reference to J. Arce's paper on Constantius' education (AC 48, 67-81) would have been feasible; p. 152: the note on demons is surprisingly jejune and unsatisfactory; p. 160: in the note on Julian's rashness in attacking Constantius a quotation from Ammianus Marcellinus 21.5.13 would have been timely; p. 314 sqq.: I am not at all sure whether the indictment of the provincial governor (ἀναχθεὶς τῷ βασιλεῖ, § 93) after the riots at Gaza should be ascribed to Christians, as K. seems to assume; p. 329: the second ''Gregor'' on this page (line 14) should be altered to 'Julian'; p. 356-7: Odysseus did not expose the trick ''mit der Palamedes sich von der Teilnahme am Zug gegen Troia entziehen wollte'', it was the other way round (cf. i.a. Ov. *Met.* 13.58, Hyg. *Fab.* 95).

More important is the treatment of the problematic phrase ὥσπερ τῆς θρησκείας ὄντα τὸν Ἕλληνα λόγον, ἀλλ' οὐ τῆς γλώσσης in ch. 5. Its interpretation is made even more difficult by Gregory's juggling with the word λόγος in ch. 100 sqq., in which passage he mesmerizes his readers by an elusive alternation of sing. and plur. in his attack on Julian's usurpation of τὸ ἑλληνίζειν. Discussing the quoted phrase on p. 47-8 K. suggests to interpret λόγος as 'Wort' or 'Begriff': "das Wort 'Griechisch' ". This, however, is impossible, as a Graecist's expert advice informs me, referring i.a. to LSJ s.v. λόγος VI and IX 3. Gregory rather means something like '(the spirit of) Greek culture and literature', a possibility which K. also brings into the discussion of the expression. It can be compared to τὸν ἡμέτερον λόγον in ch. 110, explained by K. as "das Christentum als theologisches und ethisches System" (365). In the end, however, the reader is left with the conclusion that Gregory's handling of λόγος and λόγοι cannot quite be grasped.

K.'s book has one flaw and it is a serious one. Over 400 pages of often compactly worded learning are supplied with one index of 2½ pages, an 'Index verborum' (of Greek words). This list is unsatisfactory in itself, inasmuch as several important words are missing, e.g. μάρτυς, οἰκονομία, φιλανθρωπία, φιλοσοφία and, believe it or not, λόγος. Apart from this, however, all the subjects broached, all the various pieces of information provided in K.'s comments are now almost locked up instead of being made readily available to the student who is in search of some specific point. It is to be deplored that this fine specimen of patristic scholarship is thus deprived of part of its value.

2353 BM *Leiderdorp*, van Effendreef 15 J. DEN BOEFT

Origene, Sulla Pasqua. Il papiro di Tura. Introduzione, traduzione e note di Giuseppe Sgherri (Lettere cristiane del primo millennio 6). Edizioni Paoline, Milano 1989. 172 p.

Parmi les papyrus découverts à Tura en Égypte (1941), qui contiennent en grande partie des écrits gnostiques, se trouvent aussi des ouvrages chrétiens. C'est grâce à cette découverte que Didyme l'Aveugle est sorti de l'ombre. Un des papyrus nous offre deux traités sur la Pâque, tous les deux sous le nom d'Origène.

Ces traités, inconnus jusqu'alors, avaient été publiés pour la première

fois en 1979 par O. Guéraud et P. Nautin. Le dernier, grand connaisseur des textes pascaux des premiers siècles chrétiens, y compris l'exégèse origénienne de *Ex.* 12 et du mystère chrétien de la Passion et de la Pâque, avait pourvu cette *editio princeps* d'un commentaire approfondi.

Il faut admettre que M. Sgherri, en présentant la première traduction italienne du texte et en y ajoutant, à son tour, des notes explicatives, a fait preuve d'un jugement indépendant. Par ses recherches sur l'Église et la Synagogue chez Origène (1984) il connaît à fond les écrits de l'Alexandrin. Plus d'une fois il ne partage pas l'avis de Guéraud et de Nautin. Frappé par les différences remarquables entre les deux textes, il aborde, contrairement à ses devanciers, la question fondamentale de savoir si le deuxième traité est bien de la main d'Origène. Tant dans l'introduction que dans le commentaire il discute en détail les particularités stylistiques et linguistiques du deuxième traité ainsi que les cas où l'exégèse n'a pas de parallèle direct dans les œuvres d'Origène. Il aboutit à la conclusion que, tout considéré, malgré les différences entre les deux traités, l'attribution à Origène du deuxième, comme du premier, reste la solution la plus raisonnable d'autant plus qu'on ne saurait proposer un autre auteur: Didyme, abondamment représenté dans les codex de Tura, n'entre pas en ligne de compte, Évagre encore moins.

Pour expliquer les différences entre les deux traités, Sgherri avance une hypothèse bien acceptable en proposant, pour le deuxième traité, une autre datation que Nautin (à qui l'époque entre 245 et 248 avait paru probable, et qui n'avait pas séparé les deux traités chronologiquement): il veut le situer dans la période de vieillesse d'Origène, après son emprisonnement. De cette façon l'évolution des idées de l'auteur suffirait à rendre compte des différences.

Bien qu'il ne s'agisse que d'une traduction — mais combien soigneuse —, dans le commentaire solide et substantiel maint terme grec a été discuté. Dans ses analyses, Sgherri étudie en premier lieu l'usage dans les autres œuvres origéniennes, mais sans s'y restreindre, il fait souvent appel aux écrits chrétiens en général de même qu'à ceux de Philon, puisque celui-ci pour le thème du pascha juif n'est pas sans importance.

Finissons par une petite remarque. Le passage cité à la page 135 (*Comm. sur Jean* 13,48,316 ἐν καιρῷ ἀποκαλύψεως) pour prouver la possibilité de l'omission de l'article devant le mot *apocalypse* (= Livre de la Révélation), n'a guère de force de démonstration vu qu'ici le sens général de 'révélation' est en jeu.

6523 LH *Nijmegen*, Postweg 152 G. J. M. BARTELINK

1. Caroline P. Hammond Bammel, *Der Römerbrieftext des Rufin und seine Origenes-Übersetzung* (Vetus Latina. Aus der Geschichte der altlateinischen Bibel 10). Freiburg, Herder, 1985, 551 S.

2. Bonifatius Fischer, *Die lateinischen Evangelien bis zum 10. Jahrhundert.* III. *Varianten zu Lukas* (Vetus Latina. Aus der Geschichte der altlateinischen Bibel 17). Freiburg, Herder, 1990, 48* und 580 S.

3. *Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel.* 11/2 Sirach (Ecclesiasticus) herausgegeben von Walter Thiele (3. Lief. Sir Prolog und 1,1-3,31). Freiburg, Herder, 1988, S. 161-240.

4. *Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel.* 25 (Pars II) Epistulae ad Thessalonicenses, Timotheum, Titum, Philemonem, Hebraeos herausgegeben von Hermann Josef Frede (7. Lief. Hbr 7,10-9,12). Freiburg, Herder, 1990, S. 1317-1396.

1. In ihrer Dissertation (*The Manuscript Tradition of Origen's Commentary on Romans in the Latin Translation by Rufinus*, Cambridge 1965) hatte Caroline Hammond bereits die handschriftliche Überlieferung von Rufins Übersetzung des Römerbriefkommentars des Origenes ausführlich behandelt. Seit Westcott (1887) war es bekannt, dass Rufin einen schon vorhandenen Paulustext als Grundlage für seine Bearbeitung des Römerbriefkommentars des Origenes übernommen hatte. Wichtig war später (1955) die Entdeckung von H. J. Vogels, der in zwei Ambrosiasterhandschriften (Amiens 87 und Wien 743) einen selbständigen Zeugen für den von Rufin verwendeten altlateinischen Text fand. Solange die handschriftliche Überlieferung der Übersetzung Rufins jedoch nicht erforscht war und eine kritische Ausgabe ausstand, waren die bisherigen Ergebnisse doch einigermassen unsicher. Es ist das Verdienst Hammonds, dass sie durch ihre Forschungen eine sichere Grundlage geschaffen hat. Dazu hat sie den von Rufin in seinen Lemmata gebotenen Römerbrieftext herausgegeben und das Zeugnis der Rufinschen Übersetzung des Kommentars für den Römerbrieftext möglichst vollständig auszuwerten versucht. Schliesslich werden die Übersetzungsmethoden Rufins, die im allgemeinen namentlich durch die Studie von M. Wagner (1945) bekannt sind, anhand seiner Behandlung des Paulustextes untersucht.

In diesem Zusammenhang ist zu erwähnen, dass der erste Band der kritischen Edition »Origenis in Epistulam Pauli ad Romanos explanationum libri« in der Übersetung Rufins, ebenfalls von C. P. Hammond Bammel, Anfang 1990 erschienen ist. Zwei weitere Bände werden fol-

gen, während in einem 4. Band die erhaltenen griechischen Reste des Werkes des Origenes gesammelt werden.
2. Nachdem 1988 und 1989 die zwei Bände, in denen Bonifatius Fischer die Varianten zu Matthäus und Markus gesammelt hat, erschienen sind (siehe Vig. Chr. 44 (1990), S. 303), liegt jetzt der dritte Band mit den Varianten zu Lukas vor. Das hier vorgelegte Material, das mit Hilfe eines Computers gesammelt wurde, wird einen wesentlichen Beitrag zur künftigen Klärung der Geschichte der lateinischen Evangelien-Texte liefern, wofür ja die Handschriften mit ihrer im Laufe der Zeit wachsenden Zahl allmählich wichtiger geworden sind als die Bibelzitate bei den altchristlichen Schriftstellern.
3. Nach dem Erscheinen der ersten beiden Lieferungen des Bandes 11/2 mit der Einleitung zur Ausgabe des Sirachbuches (1987 und 1988) liegt jetzt der Anfang der eigentlichen Textedition vor. Da die vielen Fragen in der lateinischen Sirachforschung bislang nicht eindeutig beantwortet sind, hat Thiele vorsichtig manövrieren müssen. Deshalb hat er nicht nur die eigene Sicht der textgeschichtlichen Entwicklung zum Ausdruck zu bringen, sondern auch eine sichere Grundlage für die weitere Forschung zu geben versucht.
4. Aus dem 33. Arbeitsbericht der Stiftung Vetus Latina Institut darf man erschliessen, dass Band 25 mit einigen weiteren Lieferungen abgeschlossen werden kann. Die Kapitel 7-10 des Hebräerbriefes (2 Lieferungen) bieten spezielle Schwierigkeiten bezüglich der Zuordnung der zahlreichen patristischen Allusionen zu den Begriffen »Opfer« und »Hoherpriester«, da ja diese Wörter im Hebräerbrief frequent vorkommen. Mit weiteren 3 Lieferungen lässt sich der Abschluss des Doppelbandes (einschliesslich der Nachträge und des Registers zu 1 Thess. bis Hebr.) erreichen.

6523 LH *Nijmegen*, Postweg 152 G. J. M. BARTELINK

Ulrich Neymeyr, *Die christlichen Lehrer im zweiten Jahrhundert. Ihre Lehrtätigkeit, ihr Selbstverständnis und ihre Geschichte* (Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae IV). Leiden-New York-København-Köln, Brill, 1989. 280 S.

Die Studie von Neymeyr schliesst sich der Untersuchung von A.F. Zimmermann (1984) über die urchristlichen Lehrer des ersten Jahrhun-

derts an. Sie will das gesamte zur Verfügung stehende Quellenmaterial, einschliesslich der Selbstzeugnisse und der Aussagen über das Selbstverständnis der Lehrer, berücksichtigen. Bei der Anordnung des Materials ist der Autor soweit wie möglich von einer geographischen Differenzierung ausgegangen (Syrien, Alexandrien, Karthago, Rom); die nicht eindeutig lokalisierbaren und die gnostischen Schriften wurden gesondert behandelt. Er beschränkt sich nicht so strikt auf das 2. Jht., als der Titel vermuten liesse, sondern gibt dazu einen Ausblick auf das allmähliche Verschwinden der Lehrer im 3. Jht., sodass einschlägige Texte des Cyprian, Origenes und Dionysius von Alexandrien und selbst die teilweise ins 4. Jht. zu datierenden Ps.-Clementina mitbehandelt werden. Auch Commodian (S. 176: »der im dritten oder fünften Jht. schrieb«) wird besprochen, wobei wir bemerken möchten, dass die Mehrzahl der Forscher sich für eine späte Datierung ausgesprochen hat.

Neymeyr analysiert seine Quellen sorgfältig, was es ihm ermöglicht, in der Vielgestaltigkeit des christlichen Lehrertums die verschiedenen Kategorien mit ihren eigenen Formen scharf zu unterscheiden. Mit Recht nuanciert der Autor Von Harnacks Auffassung, die Lehrer seinen zuletzt »in den straffen Organismus der vom Bischof geleiteten Hierarchie« eingegliedert worden, und vertritt er die Ansicht, die Verschmelzung sei vielmehr als das Ergebnis einer beiderseitigen Konvergenz zu betrachten. Bekanntlich fiel die Lehrfunktion seit der Mitte des 3. Jhts. den Presbytern zu, die allmählich besser ausgebildet wurden.

Übereinstimmungen mit und Unterschiede gegenüber den heidnischen Lehrern sind vom Autor klar herausgearbeitet worden (S. 228). So könne man eine Kategorie von christlichen Lehrern mit gewissen philosophischen Lehrern wie Epiktet vergleichen, insoweit sie auch Seelenführer gewesen seien, die ihre Schüler zu einem der Wahrheit entsprechenden Lebensstil anleiteten (S. 223); kennzeichnend jedoch für die christlichen Lehrer sei die feste Überzeugung, die Wahrheit gefunden zu haben, und ihre Tätigkeit sie eine Fortsetzung von Christus' Lehrtätigkeit, auf einem vom Herrn verliehenen Charisma beruhend. Bei der Behandlung der christlichen Wanderlehrer wird einerseits auf die Parallele mit dem Phänomen des kynischen Wanderlehrertums hingewiesen (S. 236), aber ein Hinweis auf die urchristliche Tradition (Christus selbst und die Apostel) fehlt auch hier nicht. Hervorzuheben ist die Analyse der einschlägigen Stellen in der Didache (S. 148 f.; S. 153), wobei zwischen Wanderlehrern und Lehrern, die der *stabilitas loci* huldigten, unterschieden wird.

In der Übersetzung einer Stelle aus der Kirchengeschichte des Socrates (5,22) wäre eine geringfügige Änderung vorzuschlagen (S. 101): τῇ λεγομένῃ παρασκευῇ wäre nicht zu übersetzen mit »am erwähnten Freitag« (vom Freitag war in diesem Abschnitt noch nicht die Rede), sondern »an der sogenannten Paraskeve« (= Freitag): λεγόμενος bezeichnet öfters technische Termini. (Zu korrigieren wäre *De virginate* (statt *De virginitate*): 3 mal auf S. 142, weiter im Inhalt (S. VII) und im Literaturverzeichnis; statt *positio* (S. 136, 4. Z. von unten) lese man *posito*.) Ein reiches Literaturverzeichnis und einige Indices machen das gutgegliederte Buch bequem benutzbar.

6523 LH *Nijmegen*, Postweg 152 G.J.M. BARTELINK

P. G. J. Post, *De haanscène in de vroeg-christelijke kunst: een iconografische en iconologische analyse.* Heerlen/Voerendaal 1984. Dissertation at the Katholieke Theologische Hogeschool Utrecht. XII, 283 pages, 52 illustrations. [A dissertation on the 'scene of the cock' in early Christian art]

A small group consisting of St. Peter, Christ and, between both of them, a cock, forms an intriguing motif in early Christian art. As it is not immediately evident which event is illustrated here, one normally speaks of the 'scene of the cock' ('scène du coq', 'Hahnszene'). Although many authors have studied the theme, it never has been the subject of a separate monography. In his dissertation *De haanscène in de vroegchristelijke kunst* [The scene of the cock in early Christian art] P. G. J. Post has made it his task to study this motif thoroughly and exhaustively. He starts with a comprehensive catalogue of the monuments (pp. 23-53): 121 sarcophagi (sixteen uncertain scenes are included) and ten other monuments (ivories, mosaics etc.). The monuments are analysed according to the iconographical and iconological method, which are strictly distinguished from each other.

Within the framework of the iconographical analysis, which is mainly descriptive, the first thing to be done is the 'iconic registration': what can be noticed concerning the scene of the cock, in what context is this scene found? We notice, for instance, that St. Peter raises his hand to his mouth. As for the context, we see that on the sarcophagi the scene is often connected with his arrest and the miracle of the rock performed by him. These three scenes form a trilogy. Moreover, the scene of the

cock appears in context with the healing of the blind and the Hand of God giving the Law to Moses. And, after ca. 350, together with the *traditio legis* and the *traditio clavium*. The iconographical analysis also concerns chronology and topography: one comes across the scene of the cock on sarcophagi, sculptured in the fourth century, and mainly found in Rome. The other monuments date from after the middle of the fourth century.

Post describes the development of the scene of the cock as follows. The first examples can be seen on sarcophagi dating from after 300-310. The characteristic gesture of St. Peter can also be noticed in representations of the cock-fight, where the owner of the cock that has lost raises his hand to his head or mouth (p. 77, fig. 48, 49). The scene of the cock also shows similarities with philosophical compositions (p. 78, 89). A sarcophagus in Isola Sacra shows a bucolico-philosophical scene (fig. 1), in which one can notice the common gesture of the raised hand which accompanies discourse as well as the gesture of the hand that touches the beard. The scene of the cock is often connected with Peter's miracle of the water and his capture by Roman soldiers. Also, sometimes, with the figure of St. Peter sitting and reading. The miracle of the rock, seen on sarcophagi from after 290-300, is found earlier in the catacombs, where Moses strikes the rock, whereupon water flows from within it. From after ca. 300 the arrest of St. Peter occurs on sarcophagi.

After 350 this trilogy does not occur any more. The scene of the cock, however, is also found after that date, sometimes influenced by the *traditio legis* (pp. 92-93; fig. 14, 18, 19, 20: Christ between St. Peter with the cock and a second apostle). Further, apart from the scene of the cock on sarcophagi, a small, historicizing cycle comes into being in the second half of the century on ivories etc. The cycle consists of the prediction of Peter's denial (fig. 32, 35), the denial itself (fig. 33, 39) and his repentance afterwards (fig. 36). The cock may appear in each of the three scenes.

In the iconological phase of the enquiry the meaning and content of the elements which form the scene of the cock are studied. Also the context of the scene is reviewed. As for the cock, one notices that in non-Christian art this motif refers to light and victory. On Roman sarcophagi the victorious cock symbolizes immortality. On magical gems the cock has an apotropaic function. In the popular Christian morning hymns *Aeterne rerum conditor* and *Ales diei nuntius*, respectively by

Ambrosius and Prudentius, the cock is sung of in the context of light, struggle, vigilance and victory in the perspective of Christ's resurrection. The *gallicinium*, the crowing of the cock, concludes the Easter vigil: then the rejoicing of Easter bursts loose.

In the scene of the cock Christ is the dominating figure. Sometimes St. Peter and the cock are partly hidden behind the figure of Christ. The scene of the cock is to a considerable extent a representation of Christ. The gesture of his raised hand indicates that He is speaking to St. Peter. The typical gesture of Peter denotes his reaction. Apart viewed, this gesture can indicate embarrassment and affliction, but also listening and contemplation. The context must show how the gesture has to be interpreted.

Post interpretes the context of the scene of the cock as follows. The miracle of the rock and the arrest of St. Peter are referring to his martyrdom. In this way he participates in the triumph of Christ. The healing of the blind refers, just like the miracle of the rock, to the illumination that occurs in baptism (in early Christian times baptism was called *illuminatio*). Also the tradition of the Law to Moses can be found in connection with the scene of the cock. In both scenes something is given. In the scene of the cock Christ manifests Himself to Peter as the Risen Lord (p. 164). This interpretation corresponds with the meaning of the separate elements of the scene of the cock. Peter's gesture of the hand towards his chin can be interpreted as a reaction to a theophany. After 350 the scene of the cock can be found in connection with the *traditio legis* or the *traditio clavium*. Again the context is an indication that de scene of the cock is to be interpreted as a scene of the Risen Christ, who adresses Himself to Peter (p. 167).

The scene of the cock on ivories etc. forms part of a cycle: here the prediction of the denial, the denial itself and Peter's repentance are illustrated. In this context his gesture denotes embarrassment and contrition.

Thus far I have tried to summarize Post's thesis. Involving all the elements of the iconographical and iconological analysis in his thesis the author gives an original interpretation of the scene of the cock. This interpretation is new compared with what was written by about thirty authors before him. Most of them interpreted the scene of the cock as a reference to Christ's prediction of Peter's denial (see pp. 2-16).

Post's dissertation is very schematic, with many divisions and subdivisions, perhaps too many. On p. 43, for instance, a fresco in the

catacomb of Ciriaca is dealt with. This fresco we can find back in the index under II.1.2.b.1. When there are too many subdivisions, the text loses its fluency. Since, for methodological reasons, the author separates the iconographic and the iconologic phase and inserts many summing ups and conclusions in the text, he cannot prevent certain repetitions, which sometimes harm the clarity of his argument.

The author has collected a large quantity of material, sometimes too much. On pp. 66-71, for instance, he dwells too long on the system of the production of sarcophagi, interesting in itself, but not in every respect relevant with regard to the subject of his thesis. The same may be said of pp. 101-120, where he deals with the cock in non-Christian art.

Just because the author deals at great length with all the elements that have something to do with the scene of the cock, it strikes that he does not say anything about the legend which may be connected with the arrest of St. Peter and the miracle of the rock, performed by the same apostle. (Cf. M. Sotomayor, 'Petrus und Paulus in der frühchristlichen Ikonographie', in the exhibition catalogue *Spätantike und frühes Christentum*, Frankfurt a. M., Liebighaus, 1983-1984, pp. 201-204). He gives several meanings of the different scenes of the trilogy of St. Peter (p. 158 ss.), but he does not say anything about the legend that may bind together at least two of the scenes.

In his well-documented dissertation Post has put forward many arguments to give his proposition a solid base. But by doing so he has not yet weakened the interpretation that seems obvious and is upheld by many authors. It would be strange if one and the same scene had two rather different meanings: on sarcophagi a kind of theophany, on ivories etc. the prediction of the denial. In the first case the Risen Lord is presented, in the second case Christ is shown before his suffering; in the first case St. Peter's gesture is interpreted as his reaction to the encounter with the Risen Lord, in the other case it is a sign of his embarrassment. Indeed: we have to pay attention to the context of a certain element in order to be able to interprete it correctly. So we also have to take into consideration the wider context of the scene of the cock. In the first half of the fourth century the scene of the cock is seen in the context of scenes depicting various miracles. Not only in the miracle scenes can the figure of Christ not be interpreted as the Risen Lord, but neither in the scene of the cock is the Risen Lord presented. Post rightly states that liturgical texts are most likely to mirror the mentality of

which also the monuments speak. The cock, however, does not appear only in the two foresaid hymns, but also in the gospel (Matthew 26:34 and parallel texts). As for the scene of the cock, it seems most obvious to think of the gospel verses.

It seems to me that Post has gathered many arguments to provide his interpretation, which is ingenious, indeed, with a solid basis. On the other hand I think that the combination: Christ making a gesture which accompanies the discourse, together with the cock and St. Peter making the gesture of his hand towards his head (to be interpreted here as a gesture of embarrassment), refers quite naturally to the prediction of the denial. Not only in the case of the sarcophagi but also on ivories etc. this interpretation applies. The prediction of the denial refers to a negative fact: the weakness of St. Peter. Probably the scene of the cock on sarcophagi did not only recall the infidelity of Peter (Matthew 26:34), but at the same time his repentance (Matthew 26:75) and his confession (John 21:15-19). In the latter text Peter's threefold confession of faith followed by a threefold mandate are dealt with. They are the counterpart of his threefold denial, and at the same time its sequel. The negative connotation of the scene of the cock may have been the reason why one looked for more positive scenes, combining the miracle of the rock and St. Peter's arrest with his denial, and contrasting his infidelity with his fidelity, proved by his martyrdom (cf. John 21:18-19).

This interpretation is equally an hypothesis. It lacks the originality of Post's interpretation. I think, however, that the traditional hypothesis is not invalidated by the quantity of material put together by Post. On the other hand, it seems that in the second half of the fourth century the scene of the cock sometimes differs from that of the first half, including also its meaning. Especially when Christ stands between Peter, bowing reverently, and a second apostle (fig. 20), we rather have to think of Christ appearing in majesty than of his prediction of Peter's denial. In that case a new configuration arises, made up of elements of the scene of the cock and a ceremonial representation of Christ.

Not only in the first, but also in the second half of the fourth century Matthew 26:34 and John 21:15-19 form part of the background. Before ca. 350 the prediction of the denial is emphasized, after 350 the emphasis may be on the St. Peter's confession and Jesus' mandate to him.

One could say that in the first half of the fourth century the scene of the cock refers primarily to the denial and, only secondarily, his repen-

tance and subsequent confession of faith and the mandate given to him, whereas in the second half of the century the main emphasis is, at least in the case of some sarcophagi, on what happened afterwards. At the same time a small cycle, in which the story of the denial is developped, comes into being.

One is grateful to the author: for putting together not only all the data that have some connection with the scene of the cock, but also what was said by authors before him, adding his own, ingenious interpretation.

1071 JM *Amsterdam*, J. J. Viottastraat 1 P. C. J. VAN DAEL

Jaap Mansfeld, *Studies in Later Greek Philosophy and Gnosticism*. London, Variorum Reprints, 1989. X, 324 p.

The studies contained in this volume deal with the history of the reception of ancient philosophical texts in Antiquity itself, not in the last place in the writings of Christian authors. Consequently there is a clear relation to patristic studies. Most of the papers were published between 1981 and 1988, a few have an earlier date.

Contents: I Providence and the destruction of the university in early Stoic thought; II Resurrection added: the *interpretatio christiana* of a Stoic doctrine; III *Techne*: a new fragment of Chrysippus; IV The Cleanthes fragment in Cicero, *De natura deorum* II 24; V Some Stoics on the soul (SVF I 136); VI Three notes on Albinus; VII Heraclitus, Empedocles and others in a Middle Platonist cento in Philo of Alexandria; VIII Heraclitus fr. B 63 D.-K.; IX On two fragments of Heraclitus in Clement of Alexandria; X Philosophy in the service of Scripture: Philo's exegetical strategies; XI Review of: D. O'Brien, *Pour interpréter Empédocle*; XII Review of: P. Mastandrea, *Un Neoplatonico Latino: Cornelio Labeone*; XIII Alexander and the history of Neoplatonism; XIV Bad world and demiurge: a 'Gnostic' motif from Parmenides and Empedocles to Lucretius and Philo; XV Review of: L. J. Alderink, *Creation and salvation in ancient Orphism*; XVI Review of: D. Pesce, *La tavola di Cebete*, and of J. T. Fitzgerald & J. M. White, *The Tabula of Cebes*; XVII Hesiod and Parmenides in Nag Hammadi; Addenda et corrigenda; Index.

L'église et l'empire au IVe siècle (Entretiens préparés et présidés par A. Dihle). Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique XXXIV. Vandoeuvres-Genève, Fondation Hardt, 1989. 365 pages.

The title of this collection is slightly misleading in that the greater part of the contents specifically concerns the reign of Constantius II (337-361, sole ruler since 353). During the last two or three decades both the reign and the personal characteristics of this emperor have been the object of many studies, i.a. two monographs by R. Klein (1977) and C. Vogler (1979) on the ecclesiastical policies and the civil administration respectively, which have met with a somewhat mixed reception in the scholarly world. The contributors to this volume deal thoroughly and in detail with a variety of aspects of the developments within church, state and society and their mutual relations. Firm and irrefutable conclusions are not drawn in all cases, but the readers' insight is considerably furthered, not in the last place by the wealth of material which is made available. As is usual in this series, the controversial points are brought out in the short reports on the discussions of the individual papers.

F. Vittinghoff, Staat, Kirche und Dynastie beim Tode Konstantins (1-34); E. P. Meijering, Die Diskussion über den Willen und das Wesen Gottes, theologiegeschichtlich beleuchtet (35-71); W. H. C. Frend, The Church in the Reign of Constantius II (337-361). Mission — Monasticism — Worship (73-112); C. Pietri, La politique de Constance II: Un premier 'césaropapisme' ou l'imitatio Constantini? (113-178); L. Cracco Ruggini, "Felix temporum reparatio": Realtà socio-economiche in movimento durante un ventennio di regno (Costanzo II Augusto, 337-361 d.C.) (179-249); K. L. Noethlichs, Kirche, Recht und Gesellschaft in der Jahrhundertmitte (251-299); T. D. Barnes, Christians and Pagans in the Reign of Constantius (301-343); Indices concerning geography and persons, in the latter case with references to the relevant pages in *PLRE* I (345-365).

2353 BM *Leiderdorp*, van Effendreef 15 J. DEN BOEFT

Graeme Clarke (ed.), *Reading the Past in Late Antiquity*. Australian National University Press (A division of the Pergamon Press Australia). XV, 370 p.

Introduction by G.W. Clarke (vii-xii). C.E.V. Nixon, The Use of the Past by Gallic Panegyrists (1-36); P. Rousseau, Basil of Caesarea: Choosing a Past (37-58); T.D. Barnes, Literary Convention, Nostalgia and Reality in Ammianus Marcellinus (59-92); K.

Adshead, Procopius' Poliorcetica: Continuities and Discontinuities (93-119); E.M. Jeffreys, Malalas' Use of the Past (121-146); R.D. Scott, Malalas' View of the Classical Past (147-164); B. Croke, City Chronicles of Late Antiquity (165-203); A.M. Cameron, Models of the Past in the Late Sixth Century: The Life of the Patriarch Eutychius (205-223); R. Mortley, The Hellenistic Foundations of Ecclesiastical Historiography (225-250); A. Emmett Nobbs, Philostorgius' View of the Past (251-264); P. Allen, The Use of Heretics and Heresies in the Greek Church Historians: Studies in Socrates and Theodoret (265-289); G.W. Trompf, Augustine's Historical Theodicy: The Logic of Retribution in *De Civitate Dei* (291-322); P. Brennan, Military Images in Hagiography (323-345); C.J. Stallman, The Past in Hagiographic Texts: S. Marcian of Syracuse (347-365); General Index (367-370).

Figures de l'Ancien Testament chez les Pères. Cahiers de Biblia Patristica 2. Centre d'analyse et de documentation patristiques, Palais Universitaire, 67000 Strassbourg. 1989, 315 p.

Table de Matières. J.-N. Guinot, La typologie comme technique herméneutique (1-34); E. Osborn, The excellence of Adam in second century Christian thought (35-59); D. A. Bertrand, Adam prophète (61-81); M. Dulaey, Joseph le Patriarche, figure du Christ (83-105); P.-H. Poirier, Le sermon pseudo-éphrémien *In pulcherrimum Ioseph.* Typologie et Midrash (107-122); Ch. Munier, La femme de Lot dans la littérature juive et chrétienne des premiers siècles (123-142); M. Petit, Tamar (143-157); J. Roldanus, Usages variés de Jonas par les premiers Pères (159-188); S. Deléani, Une typologie du martyre chrétien: la *Passion* des frères Maccabées et de leur mère selon saint Cyprien (189-213); G. Nauroy, Les frères Maccabées dans l'exégèse d'Ambroise de Milan ou la conversion de la sagesse judéo-hellénique aux valeurs du martyre chrétien (215-245); J. P. Bauer, *Verus Pharao* (247-253); M. Scopello, Béliar, symbole de l'hérésie: autour des exégèses de Jérôme et de Pierre d'Alexandrie (255-275); F. Heim, Les figures du prince idéal au IVe siècle: du type au modèle (277-301); Index biblique (303-314).

BOOKS RECEIVED

The inclusion of a book in this list, which contains all books received by the editors, does not guarantee its subsequent review.

Athenagoras, Legatio pro Christianis, edited by Miroslav Marcovich (Patristische Texte und Studien 31). Berlin-New York, Walter de Gruyter, 1990. XII, 158 p. DM 118,—.

Pseudo-Iustinus, Cohortatio ad Graecos, De Monarchia, Oratio ad Graecos, edited by Miroslav Marcovich (Patristische Texte und Studien 32). Berlin-New York, Walter de Gruyter, 1990. IX, 161 p. DM 118,—.

Nicolas Cabasilas, La vie en Christ II. Livres V-VIII. Introduction, texte critique, traduction, annotation et index par Marie-Hélène Congourdeau (Sources Chrétiennes 361). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1990. 248 p. 155 F.

Jean Chrysostome, Discours sur Babylas. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes par Margaret A. Schatkin, avec la collaboration de Cécile Blanc et Bernard Grillet; suivi

de Homélie sur Babylas. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes par Bernard Grillet et Jean-Noël Guinot (Sources Chrétiennes 362). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1990. 330 p. 245 F.

Abrasax. Ausgewählte Papyri religiösen und magischen Inhalts. Bnd. I: Gebete. Herausgegeben und erklärt von Reinhold Merkelbach und Maria Totti (Abhandlungen der Rheinisch-Westfälischen Akad. d.Wiss. Sonderreihe: Papyrologica Coloniensia, vol. XVII. 1). Westdeutscher Verlag, Opladen, 1990. XII, 252. p. 3 Tafeln. DM 85,—.

Samuel Rubenson, The Letters of St.Anthony. Origenist Theology, Monastic Tradition and the Making of a Saint (Bibliotheca Historico-Ecclesiastica Lundensis 24). Lund, University Press, 1990. 222 p.

Augustinus Lexikon. Vol. I, Fasc. 4 Asinus-Bellum. Herausgegeben von Cornelius Mayer cum aliis. Basel, Schwabe, 1990. 160 Sp.

Renate Pillinger, Alexandăr Minčev, Petko Georgiev, Ein frühchristliches Grabmal mit Wandmalerei bei Ossenovo (Bezirk Varna/Bulgarien). Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien 1989. Mit 27 Schwarzweiss-und 27 Farbabbildungen sowie 3 Falttafeln.

Johanna Jantsch, Die Entstehung des Christentums bei Adolf von Harnack und Eduard Meyer (Habelts Dissertationsdrucke. Reihe Alte Geschichte, Heft 28). Bonn, Dr. Rudolf Habelt GMBH, 1990. 448 S.

Caroline P. Hammond Bammel, Der Römerbriefkommentar des Origenes. Kritische Ausgabe der Übersetzung Rufins Buch 1-3 (Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel. Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel 16). Freiburg, Herder, 1990. 264 S.

Grégoire de Nysse, Lettres. Introduction, texte critique, traduction, notes et index par Pierre Maraval (Sources Chrétiennes 363). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1990. 346 p. 224 F.

J. M. Tevel, De Preken van Basilius van Seleucië. Handschriftelijke overlevering. Editie van 4 preken (Diss. Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam). Utrecht 1990. 376 p. 100,— Guilders (The Sermons of Basil of Seleucia. Manuscript Tradititon. Edition of 4 Sermons (Hom. 7, 11, 31, 35). To be ordered: Vrije Universiteit, Faculteit der Letteren, Amsterdam).

Peter Bruns, Das Christusbild Aphrahats des Persischen Weisen (Hereditas. Studien zur Alten Kirchengeschichte 4). Bonn, Borengässer, 1990. XXIV, 243 S. DM 48,—.

Michel Aubineau, Chrysostome, Sévérien, Proclus, Hésychius et alii: Patristique et Hagiographie grecques. Inventaire de manuscrits, Textes inédits. Traductions, Etudes. Variorum Reprints, London 1988.

Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel. 25 (pars II) Epistulae ad Thessalonisenses, Timotheum, Titum, Philemonem, Hebraeos, herausgegeben von Hermann Josef Frede. 8. Lieferung: Hebr 9,12-10,28. Freiburg, Herder, 1990.

Birger A. Pearson, Gnosticism, Judaïsm, and Egyptian Christianity (Studies in Antiquity and Christianity). Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 1990. 228 p.

Robert Godding, Bibliografia di Gregorio Magno (1890/1989). Opere di Gregorio Magno. Complementi 1. Roma, Città Nuova Editrice, 1990. Lire 42.000.

Henri Crouzel, Les fins dernières selon Origène. Variorum 1990. X, 341 p.

Alberto Viciano, Cristo el autor de nuestra salvacion. Estudio sobre el comentario de Teodoreto de Ciro a las epistolas paulinas. Pamplona, Ediciones Universidad de Navarra, 1990. 251 p. 2.500 pts.

Vigiliae Christianae 45 (1991), 105-122, E. J. Brill, Leiden

NOTIUNCULAE MARTYROLOGICAE IV

BY

JAN DEN BOEFT and JAN BREMMER

A.A.R. Bastiaensen *et al, Atti e Passioni dei Martiri*. Milan, Arnaldo Mondadori Editore, 1987. XLIX, 620 pages.

For the study of the 'authentic' or 'genuine' *Acta Martyrum* scholars nowadays have three modern editions at their disposal: R. Knopf-G. Krüger-G. Ruhbach, *Ausgewählte Märtyrerakten* (Tübingen 1964⁴), H. Musurillo. *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs* (Oxford 1972) and G. Lanata, *Gli atti dei martiri come documenti processuali* (Milan 1973). From these editions Knopf lacks a proper introduction and notes. Lanata undoubtedly contains the most reliable texts and the most up-to-date commentaries, but unfortunately she keeps to the narrow scope formulated in her title, which is a definite drawback for a more general use. Musurillo, on the other hand, contains a full selection, a good introduction, a useful translation and ample notes. The popularity of this edition should, however, not conceal the fact that its overall execution leaves much to be desired, not in the last place its editorial activities. For example, in constituting the text of the *Martyrdom of Agape* Musurillo evidently did not want to bow to Franchi de' Cavalieri's authority: an independent but imprudent judgment.

Apart from the editions mentioned there have also been editions of individual *Acts*. Van Beek's edition of the *Passio Perpetuae* (Nijmegen 1936) is a classic example. Other good specimina are Siniscalco's elegant edition of the *Passio Maximiliani* (Turin 1974) and Dehandschutter's thorough study of the *Martyrium Polycarpi* (Louvain 1979). Then there are the translations. The Italian patristic cornucopia has yielded some recent fruits in this field too: Allegro (Rome 1974), Saxer (Padova 1984), and Caldarelli (Milan 1985). The obvious interest in the subject in Italy has now made possible the publication of a collection of 12 scholarly edited, translated and amply commented documents. We cannot hide our satisfaction that Dutch scholars are responsible for the

bulk of this fine piece of work, which will prove very helpful for those interested in the subject.

The selection of the texts does not give reason for grave objections. It is, however, somewhat surprising that one of Prudentius' *Peristephanon*, which is devoted to Agnes, has been preferred to, for example, the *Passions* of Fructuosus, Marcellus or Agape, the last mentioned being an excellent testimony to the Great Persecution in the eastern half of the empire. This is not to deny the brilliance of the poet or, for that matter, the value of the expert comments on the text in question.

The general introduction (IX-XLIX) has been written by A.A.R. Bastiaensen, whose expertise has resulted in a well-considered survey of the various aspects of the subject. Only in a few cases our judgment tends to be somewhat different. In the 5th section B. deals with the idea that the martyr is a "continuatore della figura di Gesù Cristo sacrificato". He gives vent to his reserves concerning "un legame tra eucaristia ed acta" (XXI), stressing the relation with the "liturgia della Parola", but he does not quite bring out the fundamental personal relationship of the martyrs with Christ, which cannot at all be summed up by the term 'imitation'. In our view this deeply felt relationship is one of the essentials of authentic Christian martyrdom. Whichever the precise origin and the further implications of the term '*Christianus*', for the martyrs themselves the confession '*Christianus sum*' implies this individual bond. "I have been his servant for 86 years and he has done me no injustice. How could I utter blasphemies against my king, who has saved me?", thus Polycarp's answer to the governor's invitation to curse Christ (*Mart.Pol.* 9.3). The martyr's testimony to this bond during an official interrogation by a Roman magistrate is the heart of the matter; it is quite comparable to Jesus' trial at the hands of Pilatus,[1]

B. has also very little to say about the enigmatic title μάρτυς (*martyr*), leaving this subject to an unsatisfactory note on *Mart.Pol* 1.1. Now it is true that in the collection under review the documents (*acta*) take prime place, but some discussion of the ecclesiastical title of the protagonists could have been expected by the reader.

In the treatment of the individual pieces there is a certain quantitative unevenness. The notes on the *Acta martyrum Scilitanorum* take the same space (some seven pages) as those on the long Lyonnese letter. Now with all due respect for one of the oldest documents of Christian Latin there is clearly something wrong with proportions here. The

Lyonnese letter is a fascinating document of paramount importance, which definitely asks for a less jejune treatment than is offered here. The fine collection of papers *Les martyrs de Lyon* (177) (Paris 1978) is neither used nor mentioned in the "Bibliografia essenziale" for the piece (p. 60). Curiously enough it figures in the "Bibliografia generale" (p. XLVII) for the whole book.

Generally speaking, the editorial part of the book (text and comments), undertaken by Dutch scholars, and the translating of the texts, done by their Italian colleagues, make an impression of soundness and reliability. The great learning demonstrated in the treament of the *Acta Phileae* inspires awe, but the comments on the *Passio Perpetuae* and the *Martyrium Pionii* are perhaps the most admirable sections of the book. Here and there a critical remark is possible. Some examples: Dehandschutter's study in our view has not received its due share in the pages allotted to the *Martyrium Polycarpi*. The rendering of λόγοι by "principî" in *Mart.Just.* 2.3-4 is less convincing than Lanata's "dottrine" or Caldarelli's "concezioni filosofiche". The expression *mysterium simplicitatis* (*Act.mart.Scil.* 4) is explained as "il mistero della vera simplicità", which apart from the unwarranted addition of 'vera' is hard to understand. We venture to refer to a discussion of the phrase in this journal 35.45-7. The curious resemblance of the urgent plea by Perpetua's father to stereotyped formula's of prayer (*Pass.Perp.* 5.2-3) is not noticed (see this journal 36.388-9). In the notes on *Mart.Pion.* 17.3, where some pagan 'saints' are mentioned, a reference to comparable passages (e.g. Cic. *Tusc.* 2.52, Tert. *Apol.* 50.5 sqq., Orig. *Cels.* 7.53) would have been opportune.

However, instead of continuing with such 'minuta', we rather prefer to demonstrate our appreciation by presenting another small collection of *notiunculae*,[2] which were inspired by the study of this book.

Martyrium Polycarpi: date and 'couleur locale'. In general, the commentaries in this collection are more interested in philological and theological aspects of the *Acts* than in the historical questions they pose. The section on the *Martyrdom of Polycarp* is a typical case in point. It lacks a discussion of the date and pays virtually no attention to local institutions. Yet there is certainly room for some observations on both these aspects.

We will start with the date of the martyrium which has long been disputed due to the differences between Eusebius, who states that

Polycarp died in 167, and chapter 21 of the martyrdom, which implies a date around 155. Already Jean Bolland observed *quod anni ac diei* (of Polycarp's death) *varii a veteribus characteres non congruant.*[3] However, in 1980 the *Analecta Bollandiana* published a study by P. Brind d'Amour, who once again argued for 167 as the year of Polycarp's death. The author displayed such great and convincing astronomical learning in his article that in reviewing the *Atti* in *Analecta* 107 (1989) 210 sqq.) P. Devos criticized the authors of the comments on *Mart.Pol.* and *Mart.Pionii* for having failed to accept this convincing solution. But how convincing is it?

The Canadian ancient historian starts from the observation that the 'great sabbath', mentioned in c. 21, actually was a Sunday. This day would indeed fit in perfectly with Eusebius' notice that the year was 167, a notice confirmed by the astronomical data. Yet the thesis is in flagrant contradiction with the text of the martyrdom. It is explicitly observed in c. 7 that the *diogmitae* (below) started their pursuit of Polycarp on a Friday. Later in the evening of the same day they found the martyr on the estate where he was staying with a few friends. On the next day, 'the great sabbath' (c. 8), they brought him back into the city. There is nothing in our text which suggests that a whole day was spent on Polycarp's estate before returning to the city. On the contrary, Polycarp asked for only one hour respite before they were to conduct him back.

It is true that the exact meaning of the expression 'the great sabbath' is still obscure. Rordorf has recently suggested that it refers to the *Terminalia*, a festival which 'noch bis ins 5 Jahrhundert hinein beliebt war', adducing Prudentius (*Contra Symmachum* 2.1009) and Augustine (*civ.* 7.7) in order to illustrate its popularity.[4] Prudentius, though, comments that Terminus no longer receives offerings and Augustine clearly derives his knowledge of Terminus from Varro; moreover, the *Terminalia* are not attested outside Rome itself.[5] This solution evidently will not do. But whatever the origin of the expression may be, the sabbath certainly was a Saturday. Brind d'Amour evidently overlooked the fact that Pionius, too, was arrested on a Saturday, explicitly called a "great sabbath' (c. 2 and 3). Unfortunately, then, we have to accept that the precise date of Polycarp's death will remain disputed until more information turns up about the various persons mentioned in this martyrdom.

Regarding local luminaries and institutions,[6] the martyrium is much less informative than the *Martyrium Pionii* but not without value, as the

following examples may show. In c. 6f it is described how Polycarp is hunted down by the local police—the *eirenarchos*, and the '*diogmitae* and *hippeis* with their usual weapons'—as if he was a bandit. The comparison is revealing. The rural hinterland of Smyrna was of course ideally suited for brigandage, a phenomenon widely spread in Asia Minor,[7] and tracking down robbers must have been a routine job for the local police. The *eirenarchos* was usually a person from the highest classes, as apparently also was the case in Smyrna, as is shown by the fact that Herodes meets Polycarp in a stately carriage (8.2). In various inscriptions he is associated with the youth of the higher classes and they may well have constituted the cavalry accompanying the *diogmitae*.[8] The latter functioned as the local police, who not only had to trace suspects but also acted as prisonguards; in addition, in a number of cities they had to police the hinterland.[9] Contrary to the Roman soldiers, they were normally only provided with light arms, as presumably was the case during the hunt for Polycarp.

After Polycarp had been brought to the amphitheatre, the crowd, including the Jews,[10] asked the Asiarch Philippus to have a lion loosed on Polycarp. He refused, however, saying ἐπειδὴ πεπληρώκει τὰ κυνηγέσια, which is translated by Ronchey, the Italian translator of this martyrium, as 'i ludi gladiatori essendosi già conclusi' (12.2). The translation is incorrect. The κυνηγέσια, the Latin *venationes*, were the fights against animals, one of the munera of the Asiarchs.[11] These fights were so costly, however, that already at an early moment the Roman emperors had decided to limit the number of days and animals.[12] That is why Philip had to condemn Polycarp to be burned. On the stake, though, Polycarp did not burn as the fire had assumed the shape of a καμάρα, which Ronchey translates with 'volta'. This is not necessarily incorrect, but it hides the fact that in Ionia, Lydia and Lycia the term was typical for vaulted tombs, an until now neglected indication in the debate about the authenticity of the martyrium.[13]

Martyrium Polycarpi 2.3 οἵπερ μηκέτι ἄνθρωποι, ἀλλ' ἤδη ἄγγελοι ἦσαν. In this passage it is told that the martyrs unwaveringly bore their tortures, having set their hearts' eyes on the heavenly goods, shown to them by the Lord. They 'were no longer men, but already angels'. This remarkable phrase has not received much attention. Dehandschutter refers to Mc 12.25 par. and expecially to Acts 6.15. This last reference seems to be more relevant as it concerns the 'protomartyr' Stephen. During his interrogation by the council the participants εἶδον τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ

πρόσωπον ἀγγέλου. Luke obviously means that those present perceived an unmistakable change in Stephen's countenance, which showed that somehow he was partaking of heavenly life. Because of the author's discreet wording the precise implications are difficult to ascertain.

The text under discussion is far more direct. In his well-known study of early martyrdom[14] Th. Baumeister deals rather cautiously with it. He speaks about a "Vergleich der Märtyrer mit Engeln in *Mart.Pol.* 2,3" (301) and calls the martyrs "schon mehr Engel als Menschen" (305). On the other hand, he can also express himself more clearly: "Die Märtyrer sind in ihrem Leiden schon Engel" (303), which does more justice to the remarkable contents of the text, for which there seem to be no exact martyrological parallels.

These are also lacking in the vast domain of texts which deal with the ἀγγελικὸς βίος, the way of life pursued by the different types of ascetics. Indeed the terminology at times is quite bold, but in his relevant study Frank stresses "dass Mensch—also auch Mönch—und Engel verschiedenen Seinsordnungen angehören. Eine Angleichung zwischen beiden kann deshalb nie den Bereich der Analogie überschreiten. Alle gegenseitigen Beziehungen können eigentlich immer nur in der Weise des Bildes und des Vergleichs ausgesagt werden. Insofern ist das Wort vom engelgleichen Leben immer nur Metapher".[15] Indeed, when Gregory of Nyssa describes his sister Macrina's disposition in the face of death, he goes no further than this phrase: οἷον ἀγγέλου τινὸς οἰκονομικῶς ἀνθρωπίνην ὑπελθόντος μορφήν (GNO VIII 1. 396.2-3). The great Macrina, as he calls her more than once, exceeded her 'nature', but she remained a human being.

The two vast thesauri of references to angels in patristic texts, Michl in *RAC* 5, 109-200 (Engel IV (christlich)) and Lampe, *PGL* s.v., do not yield anything fully comparable either. A passage like Or. *Hom.in Lev.* 9.11 (*sive ergo spiritalis effectus unus cum Domino spiritus fiat, sive per resurrectionis gloriam in angelorum ordinem transeat, recte iam non erit homo*) testifies to Origen's theological speculation and breathes a spirit which wholly differs from the straightforward statement in the lemma. Its unique character provokes further research.[16]

Martyrium Polycarpi 14.3 Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ περὶ πάντων σε αἰνῶ κτλ. Having been tied to the stake, Polycarp sends up a prayer of thanks, which he concludes with a eulogy, praising God περὶ πάντων. This phrase has not been interpreted in a uniform manner. Musurillo renders "above all" and Ronchey in the collection under review agrees with this: "al di sopra

di tutto''. Rauschen (BKV 14, 304) has ''für alles'', a translation which can be parallelled by ''pour toutes choses'' (Camelot, SC 10bis, 263), ''om alles'' (Dehandschutter), ''per tutte le cose'' (Allegro).

It is not easy to decide which interpretation is correct. The phrase occurs only once in the NT, viz. 3Joh 2 περὶ πάντων εὔχομαί σε εὐοδοῦσθαι καὶ ὑγιαίνειν and here too it is differently explained. The *Vetus Latina* versions provide *per omnia, de omnibus* and *in omnibus*. Bauer s.v. περί proposes ''in allen Stücken'', ''in jeder Hinsicht'' with a reference to Plato, *Gorg.* 467D, where the context, however, is completely different and the expression is rather used to shorten the discussion ('in all such cases'). Zerwick-Grosvenor ad loc. have ''in every way''. Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 229 n.4, however, assume an equivalence with πρὸ πάντων in papyri (''vor allem''), ''obwohl sonst περὶ πάντων in dieser Bed. nicht belegt zu sein scheint''. Moule, *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek* p. 63 remarks that such a rendering ''seems improbable unless clear parallels are found''.

The restriction last mentioned indeed hits the nail on the head. Of course περί ''im Sinne der Überlegenheit...des Übermasses oder hohen Grades'' (Schwyzer-Debrunner II 500) is a well-known phenomenon in Homer, e.g. *Il.* 2.831-2 ὃς περὶ πάντων/ ἥδεε μαντοσύνας, and as a preverb it has sometimes kept such a sense (e.g. περιγίγνεσθαι), but the most usual function of περί c. gen. is ''to denote the object *about* or *for which* one does something'' (*LSJ* s.v. A II). This tallies quite well with the text of the lemma. Polycarp thanks God for the knowledge of Him which he has received from Christ and for the fact that he is deemed worthy of the sacrifice of martyrdom. These are the most important things he can think of, the fulfilment of his entire life, so that he can praise God 'in every respect'.

Martyrium Carpi 9-20. Both the Greek (§ 9-20) and the Latin (§ 2-8) versions of these *Acts* contain a debate about religion between Carpus and the proconsul. At first the two versions are fairly similar, but gradually they begin to diverge, leaving only small traces of resemblance between § 14-15 (G) and § 7 (L). Subsequently, the Greek text continues with a further development about the pagan gods (§ 16-20), in which Von Harnack detects ''ein philosophisches Gepräge'' and which Lietzmann calls an ''apologetischer Exkurs''. Lanata, whose parallel presentation of the two texts is most enlightening and helpful, follows the footsteps of Franchi de' Cavalieri[17] by concluding that this passage is ''certamente tardiva e rimaneggiata''.

This verdict can hardly be challenged, but before commenting on this part some attention has to be given to the first half of the debate. As regards its authenticity Lanata is less sceptical than Franchi and probably rightly so. Carpus' quotation of Jer. 10.11 cannot be regarded as a fully unlikely element. it occurs in other *Acts* too and is listed as one of the biblical testimonia *de idolis quae gentiles deos putant* by Cyprian (*Quir.* 3.59, CCL III 1.148.34). Besides, it is a variation on the theme of God as the sole creator of the universe, which frequently recurs in the *Acta Martyrum*. For example, in the *Acta Cypriani* (1.2) Cyprian answered the pro-consul's question regarding his views on Valerian's order to acknowledge the rites of Roman religion with the words: *Nullos alios deos novi, nisi unum et verum Deum, qui fecit caelum et terram, mare et omnia quae in eis sunt.*[18] This designation of God as the sole creator of the universe is also quoted in Acts 14.15, when the people of Lystra regard Paul and Barnabas as Zeus and Hermes and even prepare to offer sacrifice to them. Otherwise, though, the first three volumes of the *Biblia Patristica* hardly mention any other texts where Ex. 20.11 (or Ps. 146.6) is quoted or referred to.

Why this emphasis on the works of God? From the fifth century B.C. onwards there was a tendency to conceive of the deity who is the supreme ruler of the universe in as abstract and transcendental a way as was possible within the limits of the human language. It is against the background of this tendency, which we find in philosophers, such as Xenophanes, Parmenides and Empedocles, that the development of the doctrine of the knowledge of God through his works took place. This theological strategy of compensating for the invisibility of the supreme god by insisting on his works we find elaborated in different ways in various cults and philosophies, as Theo Korteweg has shown.[19] Stoic philosophers tried to solve the problem in another manner, which basically consisted in an outright identification of God and universe, but such a radical solution was, of course, impossible for Christian thinkers.

St. Paul therefore, when speaking of God's invisible qualities, limited himself to observing that these 'have been visible, ever since the world began, to the eye of reason, in the things he has made' (Rom. 1.20). And the apologist Athenagoras considered the harmonic nature of the cosmos to be one of the 'pillars of piety' (*Leg.* 4.2). In the martyrs' *Acts* this argument is slightly twisted but still recognizable. The martyrs use the argument to support their declination to worship dead gods who are

made from silver, gold or some other material. They alone worship a living god who is clearly visible in his works. It is noteworthy that the martyrs so frequently employ this rationalistic language. Evidently, when defending their faith in front of a civilized public they used arguments which they must have deemed to be attractive to that public. At the same time, these arguments distinguish them from other so-called Oriental cults in the Roman Empire, such as those of Isis and Mithras. This rationalistic tendency of early Christianity deserves more attention than it has received so far in discussions of the rise of this religion.

Having looked at the first part of the debate we now turn to its second half. There can be little doubt that the 'demonological' passage § 16-20 does not belong to any official interrogation. Von Harnack's overall confidence is not at all shared by other scholars and this certainly is one of the 'suspect' parts of the document. Even his impression that it bears "ganz das Gepräge des Christenthums des zweiten Jahrhunderts" is questionable. It is true that the description of God as 'timeless' and 'unperishable' etc. in § 16 could have been from the hand of Athenagoras or Justinus. On the other hand, the different predicates of God were of course used in later theology too. Besides there seem to be indications in the sequel which make an early date less feasible.

Having dismissed the pagan gods as merely the material products of man and as perishable by time, Carpus next abruptly introduces a hypothetical objection about the successes of divination. Indeed this aspect is touched upon in 2nd century apologetic texts, e.g. Athenagoras, *Leg.* 26.3-5, Tert. *Apol.* 22.7, but its role is not prominent and it is rather mentioned as part of a larger complex, viz. of miracles, especially of healing,[20] Besides, there is a tendency to deny or to belittle the possibilities of divination rather than to explain the phenomenon, as in the present text. This explanation is two-fold. Such activities are not due to the non-existing gods, but to the evil spirits who make use of the facilities offered by polytheism.[21] These spirits of course know their own wicked intentions and future actions and, secondly, their great experience, which results from their long existence,[22] also contributes to their prophesying capacity.

Such a way of reasoning savours of a more systematic treatment of the divinatory department of demonology, the final form of which is provided in Augustine's *De divinatione daemonum*. Carpus' two explanations figure there too. Augustine's main argument, however, consists in the swift mobility of the demons' aerial bodies. Such a view

requires a more thorough theoretical handling of demonology than can be witnessed in the present text. It may tentatively be concluded that Carpus' exposition of divination shows a state in the development somewhere between the impressions of the apologetes and Augustine's systematic treatise.

Martyrium Justini 3.2. It is clear that during his interrogation the prefect Rusticus tried to find out all the details about the organization of the Christians in front of him. At first Justinus remained evasive, but when Rustics persisted, he answered ἐγὼ ἐπάνω μένω τοῦ Μυρτίνου βαλανείου. Hilhorst comments that Myrtinos is not the name of a 'personaggio identificato' (but why should it?) and even wonders whether it is a 'nome di persona' at all. One can only share his doubt. None of the onomastic collections consulted by us mentions a Myrtinos.[23] Franchi de' Cavalieri once thought that the name was a corruption of the known *balineum Mamertinum*.[24] This is perhaps not impossible, as the later recension B has τινὸς Μαρτίνου τοῦ Τιμιοτίνου. On the other hand, a small correction would solve the problem as well: Μυρτίλου, a very common name.

Archeological excavations in Ostia and elsewhere suggest that not uncommonly the quarters above small baths were rented as lodgings.[25] And indeed, Seneca writes in his well-known 56th Letter about the busy life in Baiae: *super ipsum balneum habito* (c. 1).

Martyrium Justini 4.2 Χαριτὼ εἶπεν· Χριστιανή εἰμι τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ δωρεᾷ. It is a well-known fact that specifically Christian names were only gradually introduced and that many names which seem to have a Christian ring already occurred in pagan society. This is not to deny that such names could receive a fresh sense in the light of the Christian faith. There is a clear illustration of this in ch. 2 of the *Martyrium Agapes*, where the editor links the names Agape, Irene and Chione with 1 Tim. 1.5, Joh. 14.27 and Ps. 51.9 respectively. A far more interesting case is *Mart. Just.* 4.2 and 3, where some martyrs in answering the presiding prefect interpret their names in a Christian sense themselves. Euelpistus' answer in § 3, τῆς αὐτῆς ἐλπίδος μετέχω, has been duly noticed by Whittaker and Hilhorst.[26] There is another clear example in § 2, where the only woman in Justinus' group says the words quoted above. This case did not escape Bartelink in his study of early Christian names and their allusions.[27] It is remarkable, though, that the name of this woman, Charito,

is extremely rare. Although the name occurs in a fourth-century Athenian dedication (*SEG* XXXV.141), it is a rarity in all the major onomastic collections.[28] This absence strongly suggests that Charito did assume a new name in which she wanted to stress the importance of God's or Christ's grace (χάρις). In that case she may well be referring to Eph. 3.7 or perhaps to Rom. 5.15, passages which are also quoted in *Mart. Pol.* 20.2. On the other hand, *Mart. Pol.* 2.3 and *Mart. Lugd.* 1.6 and 24 just mention the grace of God and Christ without reference to these texts of the New Testament.

Martyrium Lugdunensium (Eus. *HE* 5.1 and 2) 1.34 ἐκείνους μὲν γὰρ ἐπεκουφίζεν...ἡ πρὸς τὸν Χριστὸν ἀγάπη. Since Perler's relevant study[29] it is generally recognized that there are some undeniable terminological resemblances between the famous letter of the churches of Lyons and Vienne and the 4th book of Maccabees and that these resemblances could well be explained as due to influences of the latter text on the way of thinking in the named churches. Especially the 'agonistic' aspects of the terminology are mentioned to prove this dependence. Some scholars have, however, called for cautiousness in assuming precise links.[30] That is a timely warning in view of the wholly different atmosphere and tenor of the two texts: 4Macc. is a diatribe with strong reminiscences of the genre of the logos epitaphios,[31] *Mart. Lugd.* is a report by eye-witnesses whose very eyes clearly saw the true course of events. This last point is quite important. All those present of course witnessed the mutilation and indeed the annihilation of human bodies, but the writers beheld something else too. For them e.g. Christ's glory (δόξα) was manifest, not as a remuneration after the sufferings, but exactly within these sufferings themselves. For a treatment of this we refer to a paper in *Studia Patristica* XVIII, 3, 111-118.

Another prominent motif is the martyr's love of God and Christ. Vettius Epagathus is filled with this love (9), Blandina's love for Christ was shown in true force (17), Alexandros was well-known because of his love of God (49). The lemma above shows that it was characteristic of the martyrs in general, whose love is further stressed in 2.6 and 7. Of course the steadfastness of the martyrs in other *Acts* could also be regarded as an implicit token of their love of God, but the explicitness of the Lyonnese letter is unique. It reminds of the 1st Epistle of John (e.g. 2.5 ἀληθῶς ἐν τούτῳ ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ τετελείωται) and is one of the many reminiscences of the NT in the letter.

As to the contents, this important motif is not parallelled in 4Macc. In fact there is a most remarkable difference. The subst. ἀγάπη does not occur in 4Macc., but there are two instances of the verb ἀγαπᾶν, one in 15.3, where the mother, confronted with the choice between εὐσέβεια and the bodily salvation of her sons, τὴν εὐσέβειαν μᾶλλον ἠγάπησεν τὴν σῴζουσαν εἰς αἰωνίαν ζωὴν κατὰ θεόν. She loved (Jewish) religion, but the Lyonnese martyrs loved God, thus testifying to the typically personal relationship, which is so characteristic of Christian martyrdom.

The love of God by the Lyonnese martyrs is clearly parallelled only by the two oldest Greek martyrological treatises, book 4 of Clemens' *Stromata* and Origen's *Exhortation to Martyrdom*. Clemens pictures the martyr as the true Christian, the "Vertreter aller Vollkommenheit", who is completely dominated by love of God. "Clemens wird nicht müde, immer von neuem darauf hinzuweisen, dass das Martyrium nur dann wertvoll ist, wenn es aus Liebe zu Gott geschieht".[32] Cf. e.g. 4.14.1 οὐ μὴν οὐδὲ ἐλπίδι δωρεῶν ἡτοιμασμένων πιπράσκων τὴν πίστιν, ἀγάπῃ δὲ πρὸς τὸν κύριον ἀσμενέστατα τοῦδε τοῦ βίου ἀπολυθήσεται.

In his *Exhortation* Origen too stresses love of God as the incentive of the martyrs, e.g. at the end of ch. 2: ...ἐπιδειξαμένους τὴν ὅλῃ ψυχῇ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀγάπην, and ch. 15: ...ὑμῖν τοῖς διὰ τὴν ἐν Χριστῷ πρὸς θεὸν ἀγάπην πατοῦσι τὴν ἀπατηλὴν δόξαν κτλ.[33]

Of course the writers of the Lyonnese letter did not provide a systematic treatise on martyrdom. They were describing the predicament of individual Christians, but their report corresponds with Clemens and Origen in that they presented their martyrs as the true Christians.[34]

Acta martyrum Scilitanorum 12. During his interrogation the proconsul Saturninus suddenly noticed that Speratus was carrying some books and he asked him: '*quae sunt res in capsa vestra*?' Speratus answered: '*Libri et epistulae Pauli viri iusti*'. Bastiaensen (ad loc.) rightly notes that the *capsa* was a "cassetta adibita a contenere rotoli".[35] He also convincingly argues that *libri et epistulae* has to be understood as *libri epistularum*. There is, however, another important aspect of this episode, which deserves some attention.

Basing themselves on the slowly increasing number of Christian biblical papyri of the second century, of which now eleven are known, Roberts and Skeat have concluded that "when the Christian Bible first emerges into history the books of which it was composed are always written on papyrus and are always in codex form."[36] The reasons for

this development are still being debated. Recently, Harris has argued that the codex form enabled theologians "to find the passage which you want to read to the faithful or use against your opponent in a theological squabble"—an explanation more inspired by experiences with modern Bible-punching fundamentalists, it seems, than with ancient methods of debate. Van Haelst, on the other hand, has proceeded along a more convincing road. As he points out, Christianity spread less quickly in Egypt than Roberts and Skeat assumed. The papyrological evidence strongly suggests that it only started to gain popularity at the beginning of the third century. Such a date is also in better agreement with the date of the earliest Christian codices, which have to be dated somewhat later than was done by Roberts and Skeat. Consequently, the rise of the codex in Christian circles was not that different from its rise among non-Christians. There is thus no reason why the codex could not have been used first by the Christian congregation in Rome, the place where anyway the codex is first mentioned by Martial. The reason for its employment instead of the scroll were purely practical. It was much better suited to be carried along than the more cumbersome scrolls which were kept on by the Jews for reasons of religious conservatism.[37]

It seems clear from Van Haelst's persuasive argument that Roberts and Skeat postulated the monopoly of the Bible codex form among the early Christians, because they were misled by the total loss of codices and scrolls outside Egypt. Moreover, as was done by Harris, Van Haelst and McCormick, they had also overlooked the passage under review. Clearly, Speratus and his fellow-Christians still read the Bible from a book-roll and not in codex form. Such a practice also fits in with the fact that Tertullian does not mention the codex either in his highly varied terminology of the Bible.[38] It would seem, then, that the codex form originated in Rome and only gradually established itself in the Roman Empire.

Unfortunately, it is not clear in which language Speratus read the Pauline epistles. Bastiaensen considers it not impossible that it was a Latin version but favours the possibility of a Greek one, since Speratus makes a cultured impression.

Acta martyrum Scilitanorum 14. When Saturninus pronounced the official sentence on Speratus and his fellow-Christians, the main ground of his decision lay in their confession of a Christian way of life. he

explicitly mentioned a further consideration: "Because in spite of the opportunity to return to the Roman tradition which was offered to them, they obstinately (*obstinanter*) persevered". Pliny found the *inflexibilem obstinationem* (*Ep.* 10.96.3) of the Christians led before his tribunal quite distasteful and Tertullian mentions that this reproach was often made against the Christians.[39] De Ste Croix, in his well-known discussion with A.N. Sherwin-White on the reasons for the persecution of the Christians, even suggests that to the Romans this obstinacy was one of the less desirable manifestations of the Christian *superstitio*.[40]

The Christians of course had a different view of this steadfastness. Those who were able to withstand the tortures which soon had become part and parcel of the proceedings gave true evidence of true endurance. This was not a virtue in itself, comparable to the unshaken *constantia* of the Stoic sage,[41] who could not really be touched by pain, injury and injustice. On the contrary, for the early Christians, as St. Paul expresses it (Rom. 5.3-4, tr. C.K. Barrett), "Affliction produces endurance, and endurance tried character, and tried character hope". Without this endurance it was a hard road to salvation as Cyprian reminded the faithful: *neque enim potest accipi dolorum et passionum corona, nisi praecedat in dolore et passione patientia* (*De bono patientiae* 10). The Christians were well aware of the need to be steadfast, and a few times bystanders are reported to have been moved to pity or admiration because of the martyrs' endurance (Pol.2.2, Lyons 56).

In the *Acta Martyrum* this steadfastness is frequently mentioned, in particular in the Lyonnese letter, in which ὑπομονή and its cognate verb occur about a dozen times.[42] It is not impossible that the Letter derives the theme from the New Testament,[43] since it shows a marked Biblical inspiration. On the other hand, the theme of endurance is much more prominent in 4Macc.[44]

Prudentius, *Peristephanon* 14.44-5 *nec trepidat sacram/spectare formam lumine lubrico*. Agnes' stubborn refusal to renounce her faith finally brought about her adversary's decision to compel her to prostitution (25-6 *hanc in lupanar trudere publicum/certum est*). Such a measure is reported more often about Christian women in similar situations. It usually is an attempt at intimidation rather than a form of punishment. A satisfactory treatment of the subject was provided long ago by Augar.[45] One recurring pattern of events is that the woman's purity is not violated. Nobody dared to approach Irene (*Acta Agapes* 6) and the virgin in Ambrose's thrilling story in *De virginibus* 2.4.22

sqq. *mutato habitu euolat...de laqueo*. This is also true in Agnes' case. Nobody so much as looks at her, apart from one undisciplined person, who casts a lascivious glance at the young virgin.

The expression *lumine lubrico* is well chosen by the poet, not only because of the powerful allitteration, but also in view of the adjective. In classical Latin *lubricus* means 'slippery' or 'unstable', both literally and metaphorically (Tac. *Hist.* 1.10.1 *lubrico statu*), though in the last case seldom directly concerning "animantes eorumque partes" (*TLL* 2.1689.83), Verg. *A.* 11.716 being one of the exceptions. Its negative connotations come out very clearly in Christian Latin, where it denotes instability and the inclination to go astray, especially in matters of faith or morals. This holds true for Prudentius, whose interesting usage of the word has received a slightly stepmotherly treatment in the lemma in *TLL*. Some instances not mentioned there: *Symm.* 2 pr. 35-6 about Peter's misadventure in Matth. 14.30: *et lapsante gradu pedes/pessum mergere lubricos*; *Ham.* 540 about the devil: *dominatio lubrica mundi*.

The moral depravity expressed by *lubricus* sometimes specifically concerns wantonness. This could be the case in Prud. *Cath.* 2.102-3 *ne lingua mendax, ne manus/oculiue peccent lubrici*. Van Assendelft ad loc. rightly stresses the difference with the purely physical sense in Cic. *N.D.* 2.142 *natura lubricos oculos fecit et mobiles*.[46] For *Per.* 14.45 there can be no doubt, as has been clearly worded by Franchi de' Cavalieri: "Solo un giovinastro ha l'audacia di fissare lo sguardo impudico in quelle angeliche forme".[47] There is a curious affinity with a passage in Clem.Alex. *Paed.*, which deals with obscenity: ἄμεινον εἶναι λέγων τοῖς ποσὶν ἢ τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ὀλισθαίνειν (2.49.2. cf. also 2.50.3 and 3.69.3).[48]

Prudentius adds further lustre to the expression under discussion by playing on the different meanings of *lumen*. The peeping Tom is hit by lightning and therefore *caecus corusco lumine corruit* (vs. 48). Some other instances of this word-play are Lucr. 3.364 *lumina luminibus quia nobis praepediuntur*, Ov. *Met.* 10.293-4 *timidumque ad lumina lumen/attollens*, Cypr. Gall. *Hept. exod* 138-9 (about Moses at the burning bush) *mox timor ingreditur sensus lumenque caligat/lumine de nimio*.

NOTES

[1] See R. Staats, Pontius Pilatus im Bekenntnis der frühen Kirche, *ZThK* 84 (1987) 493-513.

[2] Cf. J. den Boeft and J. Bremmer, Notiunculae Martyrologicae, *Vig. Chr.* 35 (1981) 43-56; Not. Mart. II, *ib.* 36 (1982) 383-402; Not. Mart. III, *ib.* 39 (1985) 110-130.

[3] J. Bollandus, *Acta Sanctorum Januarii* III, 2nd ed (Brussels, 1863) 306.

[4] W. Rordorf, Zum Problem des 'Grossen Sabbats' im Polykarp- und Pioniusmartyrium, in *Pietas. Festschrift für B. Kötting*, eds. E. Dassman, K.S. Frank = *JbAC* Suppl. 9 (1982) 245-9.

[5] Cf. P. Herz, *Untersuchungen zum Festkalender der römischen Kaiserzeit nach datierten Weih- und Ehreninschriften* I (Mainz, 1975) 145.

[6] The standard work on Smyrna remains C.J. Cadoux, *Ancient Smyrna* (Oxford 1938), but many of its details can now be corrected and supplemented with the help of G. Petzl, *Die Inschriften von Smyrna*, 3 vls (Bonn, 1982-1990).

[7] The subject has often been discussed by Louis Robert. See, for example, his *Études Anatoliennes* (Paris, 1937) 96-110; *La Carie*, vol. 2 (Paris, 1954) 42; *Villes d'Asie Mineure* (Paris 1962[2]) 268, 324 n.1; *Fouilles d'Amyzon* (Paris, 1983) 106f, 200. In general, B. Shaw, Bandits in the Roman Empire, *Past & Present*, no. 105 (1984) 3-52, who on p. 18 misinterprets our passage; A.J.L. van Hooff, Ancient Robbers: Reflections behind the Facts, *Ancient Society* 19 (1988) 105-24.

[8] Cf. K. Hopwood, Policing the Hinterland: Rough Cilicia and Isauria, in S. Mitchell (ed.), *Armies and Frontiers in Roman and Byzantine Anatolia* (Oxford, 1983) 173-81; on Smyrnaean *eirenarchoi* see now Petzl on *I. Smyrna* 469.

[9] See especially P. Franchi de' Cavalieri, *Note agiografice*, vol. 3 (Vatican, 1909) 46, 55, and vol. 7 (Vatican, 1928) 204-6, overlooked by Hopwood (n. 8); *SEG* xxxvii. 1852.

[10] On Jews in Smyrna and Asia minor see our remarks in this journal 39 (1985) 117; add now J.H.M. Strubbe, Joden en Grieken: onverzoenlijke vijanden?, *Lampas* 22 (1989) 188-204.

[11] Cf. L. Roberts, *Les gladiateurs dans l'Orient grec* (Paris, 1940) 273f, with the corrections by M. Rossner, Asiarchen und archiereis Asias, *Studii Clasice* 16 (1974), 101-142.

[12] On the *venationes* see Robert, *Gladiateurs*, 309-31.

[13] Cf. J. Kubinska, *Les monuments funéraires dans les inscriptions grecques de l'Asie Mineure* (Warsaw, 1968) 94-9; Petzl (n. 6), index s.v. καμάρα.

[14] Th. Baumeister, *Die Anfänge der Theologie des Martyriums* (Münster, 1980).

[15] P. Suso Frank, *ΑΓΓΕΛΙΚΟΣ ΒΙΟΣ. Begriffsanalytische und begriffsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum "Engelgleichen Leben" im frühen Mönchtum* (Münster, 1964) 120.

[16] Account should be taken of Apoc.Bar. 51.10 "...They will be like the angels and be equal to the stars" (transl. A.F.J. Klijn), *Acta Pauli et Theclae* 5 μακάριοι οἱ φόβον ἔχοντες θεοῦ, ὅτι αὐτοὶ ἄγγελοι θεοῦ γενήσονται and perhaps *Acta Eustratii* PG 116, 500A (Symeon Metaphrastes) ...τὴν ἀγγελικὴν ἐπιζητοῦμεν ἀϊδιότητα.

[17] A. von Harnack, *Die Acten des Karpus, Papylus und der Agathonike. TU* 3, (Leipzig, 1888) 435-65; P. Franchi de' Cavalieri, Di una nuova recensione del Martirio dei ss. Carpo, Papilo e Agathonice = *Studi e Testi* 33 (Vatican, 1920, 1-40); H. Lietzmann, Die älteste Gestalt der Passio ss. Carpi, Papylae et Agathonices, *Kleine Schriften* (Berlin, 1958) I, 239-50.

[18] In its literal or adapted form the formula also occurs in Justin 2.5 (note its philosophical wording); Apollonius 2.44; Pionius 8.3, 9.6, 16.3, 19.8 and 11; Fructuosus 2.4; Montanus and Lucius 19.5; Julius 2.3; Agape 5.2; Crispina 1.7, 2.3; Phileas 3 (L) and 6 (G) Kortekaas.

[19] See the learned discussion of this development by Th. Korteweg, The reality of the Invisible, in M.J. Vermaseren (ed.), *Studies in Hellenistic Religions* (Leiden, 1979) 50-102.

[20] Cf. P.G. Van der Nat in *RAC* 5, col. 744 sqq.

[21] This link in the argument is only implicit. It is evidently taken for granted. For the collective use of διάβολος cf. this journal 36 (1982) 383-4 and for a general treatment of demons and pagan gods cf. J.H. Waszink and J.C.M. van Winden, *Tertullianus, De idololatria* (Leiden, 1987) 73-78 and 115-116.

[22] Although τῷ χρόνῳ in the phrase ἀρχαιότερος ὢν τῷ χρόνῳ is slightly difficult to explain—presumably it is a dat. 'der Beziehung' (Kühner-Gerth I 440. Schwyzer-Debrunner II 168)—, the change into a gen. comp. is quite unlikely. The tenor of the argument is that only God is timeless. All other beings are creatures subject to time, albeit that some of them (spirits) are older than others (mankind). Perhaps τῷ χρόνῳ could also be explained as an instrumental dative: 'having gained experience by the course of time'.

[23] We have consulted Pape-Benseler, Bechtel, Preisigke, Foraboschi, Fraser-Matthews and Solin.

[24] P. Franchi de' Cavalieri, *Note agiografiche*, vol. 9 (Vatican, 1953) 24.

[25] Cf. R. Meiggs, *Roman Ostia* (Oxford, 1973²) 417: F.K. Yegül, The small city bath in classical antiquity and a reconstruction study of Lucian's "Baths of Hippias", *Archeologia Classica* 31 (1979, 108-131) 123 n. 36. We owe these references to our pupil Annemieke Versteeg.

[26] M. Whittaker, *Jews and Christians: Graeco-Roman Views* (Cambridge, 1984) 163; A. Hilhorst, in *Atti e Passioni dei Martiri*, 394.

[27] G.J.M. Bartelink, Sur les allusions aux noms propres chez les auteurs Grecs chrétiens, *Vig. Chr.* 15 (1961) 32-9.

[28] We have consulted Pape-Benseler, Bechtel, Preisigke, Foraboschi and Fraser-Matthews. Remarkably, H. Solin, *Die griechischen Personennamen in Rom. Ein Namenbuch*, 3 vls (Berlin-New York, 1982) lists *Mart.Just.* 4.2. as the only example of Charito.

[29] O. Perler, Das vierte Makkabaeerbuch, Ignatius von Antiochien und die ältesten Martyrerberichte, *Riv. di Arch. Crist.* 25 (1949) 47-72.

[30] J.W. van Henten, *De Joodse martelaren als grondleggers van een nieuwe orde* (Diss. Leiden, 1986) 324 n. 69; B. Dehandschutter in J.W. van Henten (ed.), Die *Entstehung der jüdischen Martyrologie* (Leiden, 1989) 217 n. 8. W.H.C. Frend, *Martyrdom and Persecution* (Oxford, 1965) 29 n. 159 is quite positive.

The date of 4Macc. has of course much to do with this question. In his dissertation Van Henten has modified and specified the ideas of Dupont-Sommer and Breitenstein in proposing a date around 100 A.D.

[31] J.H.C. Lebram, Die literarische Form des vierten Makkabäerbuches, *Vig.Chr.* 28 (1974) 81-96. But note the reservations and critique of H.S. Versnel, in Van Henten 1989 (n. 30), 166-77 and H.J. Klauck (ed.), *Jüdische Schrifiten aus hellenistisch-römische Zeit*, vol. III. 6 (Gütersloh, 1989) 660-2.

[32] W. Völker, *Der wahre Gnostiker nach Clemens Alexandrinus, TU* 57 (Berlin, 1952) 566.

[33] In ch. 20-26 Origen introduces the Maccabean martyrs as example. Remarkably, in dealing with the third brother's disregard of his pains he says that the young man succeeded in that διὰ τὴν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἀγάπην (25).

[34] Baumeister o.c. 64 mentions the death of Rabbi Aquiba as "Beweis der Liebe des Menschen zu Gott". This love, however, specifically concerns God's commandments and does not seem to bear the same personal character as the Christian texts in question. For doubts concerning the historicity of the 'martyrium' of R.A. Aquiba see J.W. van Henten, Das jüdische Selbstverständnis, in idem (1989, see above n. 30), 130 n. 6.

[35] For the *capsa* see Th. Birt, *Die Buchrolle in der Kunst* (Leipzig, 1907) 250.

[36] Cf. C.H. Roberts and T.C. Skeat, *The Birth of the Codex* (London, 1983) 42. Their list (p. 40-1) is now corrected by J. van Haelst, 'Les origines du codex', in A. Blanchard (ed.), *Les débuts du codex* (Turnhout, 1989, 13-35) 26-9 (we owe this reference to Professor Peter Parsons).

[37] W.V. Harris, *Ancient Literacy* (Cambridge Mass., 1989) 296, who rightly discards the explanations offered by Roberts and Skeat, which are convincingly refuted by Van Haelst (n. 36), 28-32. Martial: Van Haelst, 20f. Practical reasons: Van Haelst, 34-5, who overlooked the similar reasoning of M. McCormick, The Birth of the Codex and the Apostolic Life-Style, *Scriptorium* 39 (1985) 150-8 (equally overlooked by Harris).

[38] See the survey by J.E.L. van der Geest, *Le Christ et l'Ancien Testament chez Tertullien* (Nijmegen, 1972) 3-62 (we owe this reference to Ton Hilhorst).

[39] Tert. *Apol.* 27.2, 50.15, *De Spect.* 1.1, *Ad Nat.* 1.17-9.

[40] G.E.M. de Ste Croix, in M.I. Finley, *Studies in Ancient Society* (London, 1974) 210-49, 256-62, esp. 257, 262.

[41] For the Stoa see A.J. Festugière, *Hypomone* dans la tradition grecque, *Recherches de science religieuse* 1931, 477-86.

[42] Cf. Polycarp 2.2 and 4, 3.1, 19.2; Carpus 36; Justin 5.2; Lyons 1.4, 6, 7, 16, 20, 27, 36, 39, 45, 51, 54 and 2.4; Dasius 4.4; Irenaeus 4.9, 5.2; Euplus 2.2; Forty Martyrs 1.5.

[43] Cf. C. Spicq, *Notes de lexicographie néo-testamentaire. Supplément* (Fribourg and Göttingen, 1982) 658-65.

[44] 4*Macc.* 1.11, 5.23, 7.9, 9.8 und 30, 15.30, 16.8, 17.4, 12, 17 and 23.

[45] F. Augar, *Die Frau im römischen Christenprozess* = *TU* 13.4 (Leipzig, 1905); add now *Analecta Bollandiana* 1961, 12.

[46] M.M. van Assendelft, *Sol ecce surgit igneus. A Commentary on the Morning and Evening Hymns of Prudentius* (Groningen, 1976) 124.

[47] P. Franchi de' Cavalieri, *Scritti agiografici* (Vatican, 1962), vol. I 315.

[48] Marrou ad loc. calls this a "mot de Zénon, ap. Diogène Laërce, VII, 26", but the remarkable fact is that there one finds τῇ γλώττῃ instead of τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς

Rijksuniversiteit Utrecht, Vakgroep Letterkunde
Rijksuniversiteit Groningen, Faculteit der Godgeleerdheid

Vigiliae Christianae 45 (1991), 123-150, E. J. Brill, Leiden

STRIPPED BEFORE GOD: A NEW INTERPRETATION OF LOGION 37 IN THE GOSPEL OF THOMAS

BY

APRIL D. DE CONICK and JARL FOSSUM

Dedicated to Professor Gilles Quispel
on the Occasion of his 75th Birthday

With the publication of the article, "The Garments of Shame", by J. Z. Smith in 1966, logion 37 of the *Gospel of Thomas* was nudged into a baptismal *Sitz im Leben*. Smith suggested that the logion was an "interpretation" of an "archaic Christian baptismal rite". He defined four principal motifs within this logion: 1) the undressing of the disciples; 2) being naked and without shame; 3) their treading upon the garments; and 4) their being as little children. He concluded that these four elements were only found joined together in "baptismal rituals and homilies".[1]

As far as we have been able to determine, Smith's conclusions have never been challenged. Rather, they are regarded as a foundation upon which to build further theories.[2] The present essay is an attempt to challenge these conclusions and to propose a new interpretation of logion 37. The saying, as it is found in the Coptic text from Nag Hammadi, reads:

> His disciples said, "When will you become revealed to us and when shall we see you?" Jesus said, "When you disrobe without being ashamed and take up your garments and place them under your feet like little children and tread on them, then [you will see] the Son of the Living One, and you will not be afraid."[3]

In contrast to Smith's proposal, we suggest that the logion structurally consists of three principal motifs: 1) stripping off the garments without shame; 2) treading upon them like children; and 3) gaining the capacity to see the Son of God without fear.[4] This logion, far from speaking about baptism, utilizes common encratite teaching in order to describe

the necessary preparations for salvation and ascension to heaven.[5] Moreover, if any ritual is being reflected here, it is a primitive unction ritual separate from baptism.

1) *Stripping off the garments without shame.*

a) *Stripping off the garments: Prehistory of the metaphor.* Stripping off of garments is a common metaphor in Jewish and Christian literature for the removal of the material body.[6] The Jewish and Christian notions surrounding this metaphor are rooted in speculation concerning Gen. 3,21. According to this passage, as a consequence of Adam and Eve's sin, God made them "garments of skins, and clothed them". Prior to the Fall, Adam and Eve were understood to be luminous beings, their light even surpassing the light of the sun.[7] This light could be seen as their garment, which they lost as a consequence of the Fall.[8] As compensation, God clothed them with "garments of skin". As will be seen below, these garments, according to both Jewish and Christian authors, were identified with the human or fleshly body and needed to be cast off.[9]

b) *Stripping off the garments: Use of the metaphor in a sacramental setting.* An actual symbolic-ritual removal of clothes in baptismal liturgy can not be ascertained before the fourth century.[10] The first positive instance is Jerome's *Epistle to Fabiola.* Here the candidate is said to remove the "tunics of skin" and, upon "rising from baptism," don the "garment of Christ" which is described as a white linen robe.[11] The clothes which are removed apparently are seen as the skin, even the body, with which God clothed Adam and Eve.[12]

E. Segelberg has argued that a symbolic *depositio* in baptism is implied in the *Gospel of Philip*,[13] which is of uncertain date but probably somewhat earlier than Jerome.[14] As for the first text to which Segelberg refers, it can not be said to bear out his argument:

> While we are in this world it is fitting for us to acquire the resurrection, so that when we strip off the flesh we may be found in rest and not walk in the middle.[15]

The stripping off of the flesh occurs when people are leaving "this world"; it does not refer to a symbolic removal of clothes in baptism, which is not even mentioned.[16]

The other text adduced by Segelberg does mention baptism. It says that "the living water is a body (σῶμα)" and that "it is necessary to put

on the Living Man." In order for man to do so, "when he goes down into the water, he unclothes himself."[17] The emphasis here is entirely upon the donning of "the body" of "the Living Man" in baptism;[18] the removal of the clothes is not said to be a symbolic stripping off of the body of Adam. Admittedly, the idea may be *implied*, but we would need far more evidence for giving a baptismal interpretation to logion 37 in the *Gospel of Thomas*, which was written much earlier than *Philip*, namely around 140 C.E.[19]

The *Odes of Solomon*, which—like the *Gospel of Thomas* and probably even the *Gospel of Philip*—appear to have a Syrian provenance,[20] can not provide such evidence. H. J. Drijvers has demonstrated that the *Odes* originated at the beginning of the third century,[21] so the *Gospel of Thomas* is about sixty years older. The *Odes* may of course contain primitive traditions, but it does not seem that we can find a baptismal *depositio* of garments as a symbol for putting off the body.

D. MacDonald argues for a baptismal setting for the following texts:[22]

> And I abandoned the folly cast upon the earth,
> And I stripped it off and cast it from me.
>
> And the Lord renewed me with his garment,
> And possessed me by his light.
>
> And from above he gave me immortal rest,
> And I became like the land that blossoms and rejoices in its fruits.[23]
>
> And I stripped off darkness,
> And put on light.
>
> And even I myself acquired members.
> In them there was no sickness or affliction or suffering.[24]
>
> And I was covered with the covering of your spirit,
> And I removed from me my garments of skin.
>
> Because your right hand raised me,
> And caused sickness to pass from me.[25]

These texts do speak of a symbolic-ritual removal of garments of skin or the body, but there is no reference to baptism in these passages or even in their context.[26] MacDonald obviously has been misled by J. H. Bernard, the great champion of the baptismal setting of the *Odes*, who argued for an allusion to the investiture with baptismal garments in those passages where the Odist speaks about "putting on" a divine entity.[27] Admittedly, although "the Odes, taken *en bloc*, are not bap-

tismal hymns,"[28] Bernard's hypothesis may still hold true for *some* of them. However, when we examine those Odes in which there does seem to be an allusion to baptism, the phrase "put on" would *not* appear to refer to the donning of the baptismal garment. *Ode* 4 says: "For who shall put on your grace and be rejected?"[29] And, three verses later, it is prayed: "Sprinkle upon us your sprinklings, and open your bountiful springs which abundantly supply us with milk and honey." The latter verse may be an allusion to baptism and the following eucharist.[30] Whatever was "put on" thus would appear to have been put on *before* baptism.

This conclusion is borne out by *Ode* 39, where we read: "Therefore, put on the name of the Most High and know him, and you shall cross without danger; because the rivers shall be obedient to you."[31] This text may allude to the idea of baptism as a dangerous sea journey.[32] In order to make the journey safely, the baptizand had to "put on" the Name of God.

What is meant by the phrase, putting on a divine entity? In the verse immediately preceding the last verse, we read: "Because the sign on them is the Lord, and the sign is the Way for those who cross in the name of the Lord." This "sign" (*ʾt*) which is "the Lord" is probably identical with "the Name of the Most High" in the next verse. In *Ode* 8, 15, we read that God has set a "seal" (*ṭbʿt*) upon the face of the elect even before they existed; this seal appears to be identical with "the Name" of the savior which later is said to be with them and protect them forever.[33] This seal of the Name apparently is identical with the sign of the Name in *Ode* 39. In Revelation, the "seal" of God put on the forehead of the elect (7,2-3; 9,4) is explicitly said to be the Name of God.[34]

Returning to *Ode* 4, we may quote the verses between the two excerpts given above: "Because your seal is known; and your creatures are known to it. And your hosts possess it, and the elect archangels are clothed with it." This "sign" or "seal" (*ḥtm*) which is put on by the archangels probably is identical with the "grace" which, when "put on," makes one acceptable before God.

The putting on of the sign or seal of the Divine Name before baptism probably refers to the anointing, which in Syrian Christianity was done before the immersion.[35] The *Acts of Thomas*, a work from the same time and provenance as the *Odes*, provide substantial evidence to the effect that the pre-baptismal unction conveyed the "seal" of the Name.

The unction is a "sealing" which communicates the "seal".[36] Since Thomas invokes the Name while anointing, it is clear that the seal is the seal of the Name. Being invoked, the "Power" or the "Name" comes to inhabit the oil "which men may put on": "[...] Jesus, let [your] victorious Power come, and let it settle in this oil [...] and let it dwell in this oil, over which we name your holy Name."[37] The "Power" is identical with the "Name." In the epiclesis at the unction in ch. 27, the Spirit is called both "Name of the Messiah" and "Power".[38] At the unction in ch. 132, the oil (or the Spirit which it conveys) is called "Name of the Messiah" and "Hidden Power".[39]

In the fifth century, the Church Father Narsai in his liturgical homilies summarized the Syrian tradition about the seal of the Name communicated through the unction. Holding the oil in his hand, the priest "shows to the eyes of the bodily senses the Hidden Power..." In anointing the believers, the priest "signs the flock with the sign of the Lord, and seals upon it His Hidden Name [...]."[40]

It is logical that the *Odes* refer to the anointing as an investiture, for, after the "sealing" of the forehead, the *entire body* was anointed. In the *Acts of Thomas* ch. 157, the apostle, after having invoked the "Power" or "Name," pours oil on the heads of the naked baptizands and then anoints the man, while his female companion anoints the women.[41]

Returning to the *Odes*, we note that where unction is spoken of as a "putting on" of a divine entity before baptism, we find neither a removal of clothes before unction nor a reclothing after baptism. In the texts cited by MacDonald, however, we do find both a removal of clothes and a putting on of a garment, but no baptism. Moreover, the clothes which are removed before the donning of a new garment are obviously seen as the body which Adam acquired as a consequence of the Fall, as is evidenced by the phrase "garments of skin". Finally, the putting on of a new garment would again seem to be the oil of the unction ritual, as is evidenced by the phrase "covering of Your Spirit", for the anointment ritual conveyed the Spirit of God.[42]

Thus, the evidence of the *Odes* allows us to conclude that two rituals are described. The one sets forth unction and baptism, the other unction only. Only in descriptions of the latter is there made mention of removal of the clothes which symbolize the material body.

c) *Stripping off the garments: Use of the metaphor in relationship to ascension.* It is not justifiable to *assume* that baptism follows upon unc-

tion in the latter ritual, because the texts describing this ritual proceed directly from unction to ascension to heaven. It is true that some later texts speak of baptism as taking place in heaven,[43] but this is not the case in the *Odes of Solomon*. In *Ode* 11, the Odist, after having related that the Lord "renewed" him "with his garment" and "possessed" him "with His light,"[44] describes his lofty state and then says, "And He took me to His Paradise [...]."[45] There is no indication of a baptism being administered in the heavenly Paradise.

In *Ode* 21, after having related that he had "stripped off darkness," "put on light," and acquired a new body ("members") without affliction, the Odist says, "And I was lifted up in the light, and I passed before His face. And I was constantly near Him, while praising and confessing Him."[46] The one having stripped off the body and been anointed, thereby acquiring a glorious body, is elevated to heaven and transformed into an angel of the Countenance, *i.e.*, one of the angels performing cultic service before God and therefore being allowed to see his face.[47] He is not baptized.

Even *Ode* 25 may speak of an ascension, for after having stated that he removed his "garments of skin", the Odist says: "For Your right hand lifted me up." In any case, baptism is not mentioned.

It would seem that the *Odes of Solomon* have added a cultic expedient to the kind of encratite soteriology which was espoused by the group behind the *Gospel of Thomas*. Originally, leaving the body and ascending to heaven and gazing on God or the divine hypostasis did not require unction or any other sacramental act.

There is much evidence to this effect. To Philo, "the tunics (χιτῶνας) of skin [Gen. 3,21]" is "symbolically the natural skin of the body (τὸ τοῦ σώματος φυσικὸν δέρμα)."[48] It must be stripped off upon ascension to heaven: "the soul that loves God" has "disrobed itself of the body (ἐκδῦσα τὸ σῶμα)" and has "fled far away (φυγοῦσα)."[49] Interestingly, Philo describes this as one of the "three ways in which the soul is made naked."[50] Moreover, Philo explains that "those who have made a compact and a truce with the body (σῶμα) are unable to cast off (ἀπαμφιάσασθαι) from them the garment of flesh (τὸ σαρκῶν περίβλημα)."[51]

When describing the nature of the "intellect" in comparison to that of "sense-perception", Philo says that "our soul moves often by itself, stripping itself of the entire encumbrance of the body (ὅλον τὸν σωματικὸν ὄγκον ἐκδῦσα)."[52] This last passage uses language found in descriptions

of the ascent of the wise: once one has stripped oneself of the body and has "escaped from the noisy pack of the senses," one apprehends with the "intellect only" (τὰ νοήσει μόνῃ) and exists in an "unclad movement" (τὴν γυμνὴν κίνησιν). The one who is clad (ἐπαμπισχομένη) in the body, however, apprehends with the objects of sense perception: that is, he has been "swept down" (κατασύρεται) to the world of sense perception.[53]

In *De posteritate Caini*, Philo discusses the ascent of the wise, when the wise person goes up "to the heights" like Rebecca who, after going down to the spring to fill her pitcher, "came up again." Rebecca is a type of the wise who "is enamoured of spiritual objects" and so "has learned by use of reason to rid herself completely of the body which the waterskin represents (ἔμαθε γὰρ ἡ ἀσωμάτων ἐρῶσα ὅλον ἀποδύεσθαι λογισμῷ τὸν ἀσκόν, τὸ σῶμα)." Hagar is a type of the foolish who brought "a skin (ἀσκὸν) to the place of drawing water." Rebecca, however, brought a "pitcher" and had "no need of any bulky leathern vessel" (δερματίνου ὄγκου ⟨τὸ⟩ παράπαν οὐδενός) which, as we just saw, is equated with the waterskin or body (ἀσκός or σῶμα).[54] Notice the similarity in language with the above-mentioned passage from *De somniis* in which Philo speaks of the soul stripping itself of the encumbrance of the body (ὅλον τὸν σωματικὸν ὄγκον ἐκδῦσα). The same image is used here for Rebecca who, because she is "enamoured of spiritual objects," has no need for the vessel of the body. There is a strict dichotomy between the spiritually-oriented wise person who sees God and the foolish person who is weighted down by the bulky vessel of skin and sees only through the physical eyes.

Frequently, Moses is described by Philo as a type of the wise who ascends to God. God's command in Exod. 29,24, "Go, get thee down, and come up," is compared to Rebecca's descent to the spring and her ascent immediately following.[55] When Philo interprets Exod. 24,18, where it is described that Moses went up to God on Mt. Sinai, he explains that "to such strains [melodies of heaven] it is said that Moses was listening, when having laid aside his body (ἀσώματον γενόμενον); for forty days and as many nights he touched neither bread nor water at all." Philo concludes from this that partaking in the heavenly world quite literally requires that one put aside the mortal body and its needs by becoming an ascetic. The rationale for this is described by Philo in the following manner:

> If the sound of it [the perfect harmony of the heavens] ever reached our ears, there would be produced irrepressible yearnings, frantic longings,

> wild ceaseless passionate desires, compelling to abstain even from necessary food, for no longer should we take in nourishment from meat and drink through the throat after the fashion of mortals, but, as beings awaiting immortality, from inspired strains of perfect melody coming to us through our ears.[56]

In another of his writings, Philo states that according to Exod. 33,7 when Moses went outside the camp and pitched the "tent of testimony," Moses was leaving his body and apprehending the "wisdom testified to by God." Furthermore, everyone who sought God "went out to it." Philo concludes that if one is to seek God, one must *not* remain in the "heavy encumbrances of the body" (σωματικοῖς ὄγκοις) but "go out from yourself" (ἐξελθοῦσα ἀπὸ σαυτῆς).[57] Moses who "pitched his own tent outside the camp (Exod. 33,7) and the whole array of bodily things (τοῦ σωματικοῦ παντός)" are likened to the sort of wise men, according to Philo, who have "disrobed themselves of all created things "(πάντα ἀπαμφιασάμενον τὰ ἐν γενέσει) and "naked will come to God" (γυμνῇ πρὸς θεὸν ἀφίξεται). It is only in such a state of "nakedness" that Moses begins "to worship God" as he ascends to heaven and, "entering the darkness, the invisible region, abides there while he learns the secrets of the most holy mysteries."[58]

Some Christians described the body in similar terms and incorporated these notions into their soteriological schemes. These Christians concluded that when one returned to the heavenly world or to the primordial condition of Paradise, one would be required to remove the material body or garment of skin.[59] The notion that the material body must be stripped off during the resurrection is at least contemporary with Paul. In his discussion about the spiritual body in 2 Cor. 5,1-10, Paul is seen to be in dialogue over this very issue. He presents the view that in the resurrection believers will be "putting on" (ἐπενδύσασθαι) the "heavenly dwelling" (5,2) so that "what is mortal may be swallowed up by life" (5,4). He goes out of his way to make clear to his audience that believers will not be "unclothed" (ἐκδύσασθαι) of their mortal bodies but will be "further clothed" (ἐπενδῦσασθαι) with spiritual bodies (5,4). Additionally, Paul states that the reason that the spiritual body is "put on" (ἐνδυσάμενοι) is so that, when the mortal body is removed at the time of the resurrection, the person will not be naked before God (5,3).[60] Thus, nakedness to Paul is the condition of having removed the mortal garment of flesh.

Apparently, Paul is in a heated debate with a view that during the

final resurrection, when the believers ascend to heaven, they will strip off their mortal bodies in order to lay bare their spiritual selves before God. Paul instead, contends that the believer will not stand naked before God, but that the mortality will be destroyed by being "swallowed up" by the heavenly body given by God (5,4).[61]

A noteworthy parallel to Paul's own debate is the discussion put forward in the Jewish portion of the *History of the Rechabites*[62] in which the Blessed Ones on the Paradise-like island are all *naked*. The human visiting the island asks them, "Why are you naked?" He is told, "You are the one who is naked, and you do not discern that your garment is corrupted, but my own garment is not corrupted,"[63] because "we are naked not as you suppose, for we are covered with a covering of glory...."[64]

Furthermore, the *History of the Rechabites* provides a link between naked people having ascended to Paradise and Adam and Eve. They are described as "mortals" who are "purified and spotless,"[65] beings who are "Earthly Angels".[66] The text states that "...these blessed ones are like Adam and Eve before they sinned,"[67] and who "are covered with a *stolē* of glory like that which clothed Adam and Eve before they sinned."[68] Thus, these purified mortals had attained the pre-Fall state of blessedness, a state when Adam and Eve were "naked" glorious light-beings in the Garden.

It is also important to note that the *History of the Rechabites* contains a passage which records that the Blessed Ones take on lives of "virginity" on this Paradise-like island.[69] As we shall see in the next section, the imagery of asexuality is often found to be connected with the motifs of shedding the body and ascending to heaven, most probably because the state of Adam before the Fall was thought to be a state of asexuality. Thus, to become like the pre-Fall Adam, the Blessed Ones have removed their earthly bodies, ascended to a heavenly realm, are covered with glory, and now participate in lives of celibacy.

We conclude that the removal of the garment describes the removal of the material body during ascension to a heavenly realm. Additionally, with the exception of the *Odes*, this imagery is *not* employed in primitive sacramental settings. Moreover, the *Odes*, when employing this imagery, speak of unction, not baptism.

d) *Shamelessness*. The stripping off of the garments in logion 37 is qualified by one additional expression: the garment must be stripped off without being ashamed. Again, this expression finds it origins in the

Genesis story. According to Gen. 2,25, the primordial state of Adam was a state when man and woman were naked and not ashamed. After the Fall, Gen. 3,7 says, Adam and Eve's "eyes were opened, and they knew that they were naked." Genesis does not explicitly state that Adam and Eve *became ashamed*, but this was elaborated on in some pseudepigraphic works. Eve, in *Jubilees*, "covered her shame with a fig leaf" and *then* gave Adam the fruit to eat. Now Adam's "eyes were opened and he saw that he was naked. And he took a fig leaf and sewed it and made an apron for himself. And he covered his shame."[70]

The creative author of the *Apocalypse of Moses* expressed the dilemma of "shame" in another manner. After she is tricked by the serpent, Eve cries, "I looked for leaves in my region so that I might cover my shame, but I did not find any from the trees of Paradise, since while I ate, the leaves of all the trees of my portion fell, except those of the fig tree only." Eve sews a skirt for herself from the fig leaves and then seduces Adam into eating the forbidden fruit.[71]

Once more, the *Gospel of Thomas* is interpreting the Genesis account: when one strips off the mortal body and returns to Adam's pre-Fall state, one also is returning to the primordial experience of "not being ashamed" before Adam and Eve's "eyes were opened."[72]

2) *Treading on them like little Children.*

a) *Treading on them*. Smith has suggested that the image of treading on the garments witnesses to a baptismal context. This motif was identified by Smith as belonging to the ceremony of exorcism which occurred while the intitiand stood upon sackcloth.

This, however, was a *pre*-baptismal ceremony[73] and was *not* "typical" of the Syrian baptismal praxis as Smith seems to believe.[74] Rather, as A. F. J. Klijn has noted, this custom is only found in very late texts from Narsai and Theodore of Mopsuestia and is not present in other Syrian baptismal liturgies.[75] In fact, Klijn states that, "in ancient Syrian baptism liturgy neither the exorcism of the candidates for baptism nor of the baptismal water is known."[76] Clearly, Smith's understanding of the motif of trampling on one's garment is unsatisfactory.

Far from referring to the pre-baptismal rite of exorcism, this image simply refers to an act of renunciation, specifically an act of renouncing that which is being trampled upon. A demonstration of this idea is seen

in Josephus' account of the child Moses renouncing the Egyptian rule by trampling on the king's diadem:

> [Thermuthis] put the infant into her father's hands: so he took him, and hugged him close to his breast; and on his daughter's account, in a pleasant way, put his diadem upon his head; but Moses threw it down to the ground, and in a puerile mood, he wreathed it round, and trod upon it with his feet...[then the scribe said to the king] "he himself affords an attestation to the prediction of the same thing, by his trampling upon your government, and treading upon your diadem."[77]

Here the child Moses, as a symbolic foreshadowing of his adult career, tramples on the king's diadem, thus renouncing the Egyptian government and rule.

In several gnostic texts, the image of "trampling" is used to describe the act of renunciation. A Coptic Manichaean psalm speaks of Jesus, apparently during his resurrection, putting off the "vain garment of the flesh" and causing "the clean feet of my soul to trample confidently upon it."[78]

A striking passage from the Nag Hammadi Valentinian fragment entitled *On the Anointing* (NHC 11,2a) associates the action of trampling on various aspects of the physical cosmos such as snakes, scorpions, and the power of the Devil, with unction. In fact, it is the unction that enables the candidate to renounce this world and its powers.[79]

This view of unction is also preserved in another gnostic text, the *Hypostasis of the Archons*. After the candidate is anointed with the "unction of Life eternal", he is said to be able to overcome death by trampling it underfoot.[80] Significantly, the motif of ascension is also present: after the candidate is anointed and thus has trampled on death, he "will ascend into the limitless light."[81]

Clearly, the *Gospel of Thomas* is sharing in this type of imagery. In logion 37, trampling on the garments refers to the act of renouncing these garments, that is, the mortal body.

Unlike the two Nag Hammadi texts just quoted, *Thomas* does not associate the act of trampling on the "garments" with unction or any other sacrament. In this it is similar to a saying in the *Gospel of the Egyptians*:

> When Salome asked when what she had inquired about would be known, the Lord said, "When you have trampled on the garment of shame and when the two become one and the male with the female (is) neither male nor female."[82]

This saying is found in a discussion by Clement of Alexandria which focuses on the encratite understanding of "error", that is, sexual intercourse. Clement states that the encratite leader Julius Cassianus used this logion in order to substantiate his teaching that sexual tendencies must be renounced, thereby creating an asexual person. The "garment of shame" obviously refers to the body which is controlled by sexual impulses. This passage connects trampling on the "garment of shame" with the making of the male and female into something neither male nor female, that is, an asexual being.

Thomas can be seen to employ the garment metaphor in much the same manner as the *Gospel of the Egyptians* and Cassianus. The garment which was given to man as a consequence of the Fall, or intercourse, must be removed in order to ascend to the heavenly realm and return to the Pre-Fall state of shamelessness.[83]

It is important to note that the motif of becoming asexual in the *Gospel of the Egyptians* does not seem to occur in a baptismal context but rather in an *eschatological* setting, for Salome questions Jesus about the fulfillment of things that would happen in the future.[84] This eschatological setting is seen clearly in the version of the saying given by 2 *Clement*:

> For the Lord himself, on being asked by someone when the Kingdom would come, said, "When the two shall be one and that which is without as that which is within, and the male with the female neither male nor female."[85]

Note that the setting of the saying as furnished by 2 *Clement* is that of an eschatological question followed by an answer which teaches about asexuality.

Logion 37 is similar to the saying occurring in the *Gospel of the Egyptians* and 2 *Clement*, but it would not be right to interpret it futuristically. In *Thomas*, a futuristic eschatology is lacking. The eschatology in *Thomas* is realized and spiritualized.[86] Thus, rather than pointing to the future for the return to asexuality, logion 37 understands the return of asexuality to be a present possibility. An appropriate mythological expression of this realized eschatology is the notion of an ascension to heaven.

b) *Like little children*. In our logion, the idea of asexuality, rather than being dependent on gender terminology as found in the *Gospel of the Egyptians*, is expressed by the image of little children. The act of renouncing the body is said to be like an act of little children. Also in

logia 21 and 22, the encratites are said to be like children.[87] E. Peterson has collocated these two logia with Christian texts where Adam in Paradise is described as a παιδίον, "child" or "infant", or a νήπιος, "infant" or "innocent one".[88] Citing Gen. 2,25, they "were both naked and were not ashamed," Irenaeus says that Adam was a "virgin" and "had no understanding of the procreation of children, for it was necessary that they [*i.e.*, Adam and Eve] first should come to adult age..."[89] "Adam and Eve were naked and were not ashamed, for their thoughts were innocent and childlike, and they had no conception or imagination of the sort that is engendered in the soul by evil, through concupiscence, and by lust..."[90]

At about the same time as Irenaeus wrote, Theophilus of Antioch, in a discussion on the Tree of Knowledge, said: "In his actual age, Adam was as old as an infant (τῇ δὲ οὔσῃ ἡλικίᾳ ὅδε Ἀδὰμ ἔτη νήπιος ἦν)."[91] According to Theophilus, God wanted Adam to "remain single and pure (ἁπλοῦν καὶ ἀκέραιον) for a longer time, remaining in infancy."

Clement of Alexandria, slightly later than Irenaeus and Theophilus, also understands the pre-Fall Adam to have been a child in Paradise. When in Paradise, Adam "played like a child without constraint (ἔπαιζε λελυμένος)." It was only when he "fell into lust" (ὑποπίπτων ἡδονῇ), that "the child became a man (ὁ παῖς ἀνδριζόμενος)."[92]

This imagery throws light on logion 37 as well as logia 21 and 22. The encratite who renounces the body ("tramples on the clothes") is compared to a little child, because he has returned to the pre-Fall state of Adam, when the first human was an innocent child without concupiscence.[93]

3) *Having the capacity to see God without fear.*

a) *Seeing God.* Perhaps the most important part of logion 37 is the recognition that once one has removed the body and renounced it, one is able to "see" God. The whole logion is framed with the question of being able to "see" God: the disciples introduce the logion by asking when Jesus will be revealed to them and when they will be able to see him. The logion concludes with the striking statement: "then you will see the Son of the Living One, and you will not be afraid."[93a]

To gaze at God or the divine hypostasis was the aim of apocalypticists and mystics ascending to heaven.[94] This is apparent throughout the mystical texts starting with 1 *Enoch* 14,67.[95] Moreover, Philo often

describes the ascension of Moses as the experience of "seeing" God. In the *De posteritate Caini*, Philo states that Moses yearns to "see (ὁρᾶν) God and to be seen (ὁρᾶσθαι) by Him." Moses even asks God to reveal His Presence to him. Philo then tells us that Moses ascended to God by entering into "the thick darkness where God was (Exod. 20,21), that is into conceptions regarding the Existent Being that belong to the unapproachable region where there are no material forms."[96] Philo frequently takes great deliberation in describing Moses' attempts to "see" God after he has ascended to heaven as related in Exod. 33. Two passages from Philo illustrate this point. The first text is from *De mutatione nominum* where Moses "entered into the darkness" or, as Philo interprets, into "existence invisible and incorporeal." In this heavenly realm, Moses "searched everywhere and into everything in his desire to see (ἰδεῖν) clearly and plainly Him, the object of our much yearning, Who alone is good."[97] But Philo insists that God alone "by His very nature cannot be seen (ὁρᾶσθαι),"[98] because, as the second text, from *De fuga et inventione*, explains, "the man that wishes to set his gaze upon the Supreme Essence, before he sees (ἰδεῖν) Him will be blinded by the rays that beam forth all around Him."[99] Thus, Philo states that God said to Moses, "What is behind Me thou shalt see, but My face thou shalt by no means see" (Exod. 33,23).[100]

Furthermore, Philo describes the condition of mortality, as a state in which man is incapable of seeing God. Apparently, this incapacity resulted from the Fall when man preferred "misery the soul's death to happiness the real life," and when he "gorged" himself with "ignorance and corruption."[101] Thus, Philo states that when God asked Adam, "Where art thou?" (Gen. 3,9),[102] Adam answered appropriately, "Here where I am; where those are who are incapable of seeing (ἰδεῖν ἀδυνατοῦντες) God; where those are who do not listen to God; where those are who hide themselves from the Author of all things..."[103] As a matter of fact, Philo explains that it is not possible for a person "whose abode is in the body and the mortal race (κατοικοῦντα ἐν σώματι καὶ τῷ θνητῷ γένει)" to be "with God" (συγγενέσθαι θεῷ).[104] This is only possible for the person whom God "rescues out of the prison" (ἐκ τοῦ δεσμωτηρίου διαρρύεται), which presumably here is the body and the mortal race.[105] With this exegesis of the Genesis story, it is understandable why Philo insists that, in order to ascend to a heavenly realm and attempt to "see" God, one must put aside the material body.

A remarkable parallel to the motifs presented in logion 37 is the ascension and vision of Enoch as related in 2 *Enoch* ch. 22.[106] In this ascension narrative, Enoch *sees* God and falls to the ground. Then he is made to stand up, and God says, "Do not be afraid."[107] Enoch now is *stripped* of his "earthly garments." Next, Enoch is anointed and made like the angels. Here, even though the removal of the "earthly garments" is found after the ascension and first gazing at God, we do witness a common nexus of ideas: stripping and seeing God without fear.

Interestingly, this common nexus of ideas is connected with the ritual of anointing. In fact, this ritual brings about Enoch's change: Enoch is said to have been transformed into one of the angels of the Countenance, that is, the angels who may *see* the divine Countenance. Enoch becomes "like one of the glorious ones, and there was no observable difference" so that he can "stand in front of my [God's] face forever."[108]

When Isaiah, in the *Ascension of Isaiah*,[109] is taken up to heaven in order to "see" God and the Son, he has to leave his "body" behind.[110] As a matter of fact, the angel who is sent to Isaiah informs him that he will not gain knowledge of the angel's name because Isaiah will have to "return into this body" after his vision.[111] The angel explains that his purpose in coming to Isaiah is to "take you up" so that "you will see."[112] Once in the seventh heaven, Isaiah has a "garment" waiting for him.[113] Having ascended, be first "sees" in the seventh heaven "Enoch [who also had ascended] and all who were with him, *stripped of their garments of the flesh*." They were clad "in their higher garments" and were "like the angels who stand there in great glory."[114] After a while, Isaiah "sees" God whom he describes as the "Great Glory".[115] At the end of the book, he is bid to return into his "garment" on earth.[116] Again we have a common nexus of motifs: one must strip away the mortal body or garment when ascending to heaven; once in heaven, one "sees" God.

The *Hymn of the Pearl*, found in the *Acts of Thomas*,[117] also testifies to this common nexus of ascension themes. This extended allegory speaks about a prince (the soul) who is sent into Egypt (the world) in order to recover a pearl (the purity of the soul). Upon leaving his father's kingdom (descending to earth), he strips off his glorious robe (his heavenly body) and dons Egyptian garments (his physical body) as a disguise. But soon he forgets his mission. The prince's parents, how-

ever, send him a letter which reminds him of his task. So he recovers the pearl and "having stripped off the filthy garment," he leaves Egypt and travels back to his father's kingdom (ascends to heaven). Once he has arrived, he "sees" his glorious robe and states that "the image of the King of kings was entirely upon it [the robe]." He is then clothed in it.[118] Even though the prince does not directly see God, the idea of "seeing" interestingly is not totally absent. The prince "sees" the glorious robe as well as the image of God upon it. Moreover, the hymn ends by telling that the prince made his appearance before his father (God).

b) *Without Fear.* As with so many of the motifs already discussed, this motif also refers to the Genesis account of the Fall. After the Fall, Adam and Eve hid themselves from the sight of God because, according to Adam, "I was afraid, because I was naked" (3,10). Thus, we can infer that *before* the Fall, Adam was *naked* (that is, not clothed with the garment of skin) but not *ashamed*, and *saw* God and was *not afraid.*

Because of the Fall and its consequences (one of them being that Adam was afraid to see God), it is natural that feelings of fear are often described in ascension narratives when the person ascending returns to Paradise and faces God. For instance, in the *Ascension of Isaiah*, when Isaiah finally reaches the seventh heaven, the sound of a heavenly voice causes him to tremble and be afraid.[119]

The *Life of Adam and Eve* recounts the story of Adam's ascension to the "Paradise of the righteous" where he "saw the Lord sitting and his appearance was unbearable flaming fire."[120] At this sight, Adam exclaims that "I was disturbed when I saw this; fear laid hold of me."[121]

Finally, we should note the ascension of the patriarch Enoch to the throne of the Great Glory in 1 *Enoch* 14. As Enoch ascended into heaven, he approached a "great house". He states, "Fear covered me and trembling seized me." Thus he fell upon his face.[122] At this point in the narrative, Enoch has another vision. He saw a "second house" and he "saw inside it a lofty throne" and the "Great Glory was sitting upon it."[123] Enoch explains that he was still prostrate and "trembling" with his face covered.[124]

Moreover, it is noteworthy that when the person who has ascended to the Pre-Fall state by removing his earthly garments, he is no longer afraid to stand before God. This is clearly the case in 2 *Enoch*: when Enoch strips off his "earthly garment," is anointed, and becomes like an angel, he is no longer afraid, but freely converses with God:

> And the Lord, with his own mouth, called to me, "Be brave, Enoch! Don't be frightened! Stand up, and stand in front of my face forever"...The Lord said to Michael, "Take Enoch, and extract (him) from the earthly clothing. And anoint him with the delightful oil, and put (him) into the clothes of glory." And Michael extracted me from my clothes. He anointed me with the delightful oil...And I gazed at all of myself, and I had become like one of the glorious ones, and there was no observable difference...And the Lord spoke to me: "Whatever you see, Enoch, things standing still and moving about and which were brought to perfection by me, I myself will explain it to you."[125]

Apparently, Enoch has returned to the primordial condition of Adam, that is, when Adam did not have a garment of skin but was naked and unafraid to see God and converse with Him.

Significantly, the imagery in this passage parallels that which we found earlier in the *Odes of Solomon*, especially *Odes* 21 and 36.[126] In the *Odes*, ascension into God's presence was shown to be linked to the stripping and anointing of the chosen individual. The result of these actions was the transformation of the individual into an angelic-like being, a being who lived in God's presence and passed before his face. Just as in 2 *Enoch* 22, there was no mention of baptism.

Conclusion

The three principal motifs which comprise logion 37 are deeply rooted in Adamic topology and demonstrate a Jewish-Christian exegesis of the Genesis story most analogous to the encratite exegesis taught by Julius Cassianus. The "garment" is a metaphor for the physical body which was given to Adam as a consequence of the Fall. In the soteriological scheme, this garment must be removed and renounced. This is accomplished by becoming asexual and modeling one's lifestyle after that of Adam when he was still an innocent child. When the body of shame and sexual intercourse have been "trampled upon", the believer achieves a new state, a Paradise-like state in which he can ascend to a heavenly realm and, walking before God, gaze at Him unencumbered by the shame of Adam's Fall.

Further, logion 37 is *not* baptismal. 2 *Enoch* and the *Odes of Solomon*, the earliest sacramental texts on the removal of clothing, speak of an unction ceremony that is not even part of a baptismal ritual. Moreover, a couple of gnostic texts seem to connect the symbolic act of treading on physical aspects of the cosmos with unction. But because

this nexus of ideas found in logion 37 occurs also in non-sacramental settings, it can not be proven beyond a shadow of a doubt that saying 37 is a witness to unction.

Regardless of whether or not logion 37 testifies to the sacrament of unction, it is clear that encratism, according to this logion, was a requirement for salvation and the return to the pre-Fall condition of Paradise where one stripped off the body, ascended to heaven, gazed at God, and became like one of the angels.

NOTES

[1] See J. Z. Smith, The Garments of Shame, *History of Religions* 5 (1966) 217-238. For the above quotations, refer to p. 235, 218, and 237 respectively.

[2] S. L. Davies, when discussing logion 37, uncritically restates Smith's arguments and conclusions, and then moves on to argue for an actual baptismal *Sitz im Leben* for the *Gospel of Thomas* itself. He goes as far as stating that the *Gospel of Thomas* was "part of the post-baptismal instruction of new Christians"; see *The Gospel of Thomas and Christian Wisdom* (New York 1983) 117-137. K. King concludes that entering the kingdom in the *Gospel of Thomas* is "virtually synonymous with belonging to the Thomas group/community", and that entry into this kingdom or community occurs through baptism; see Kingdom in the Gospel of Thomas, *Forum* 3 (1987) 53 and 67-69. D. MacDonald also relies upon Smith's conclusions and argues that even the *Sitz im Leben* of the primitive "Dominical Saying" upon which logion 37 possibly is based is that of baptism; see *There is No Male and Female: The Fate of a Dominical Saying in Paul and Gnosticism*, Harvard Dissertations in Religion 20 (Philadelphia 1987) 50-63.

[3] B. Layton (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Codex II,2-7*, Nag Hammadi Studies XX, The Coptic Gnostic Library (Leiden 1989) 68. T. Lambdin provides the English translation in the same volume, p. 69.

[4] In Rev. 1,18, the "Living One" is Christ. This is probably an epexegetical expansion of the preceding "the First and the Last." The latter is essentially the same as the name "Alpha and Omega" used of God in 1,8. The "Living One," too, is a divine name. For occurrences in the Greek versions of the Old Testament and Pseudepigrapha, see W. Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter*, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 21 (3rd edition by H. Gressmann; Tübingen 1926) 311 n. 4.

[5] G. Blond, Encratisme, in M. Viller, F. Cavallera, and J. DeGuibert (eds.), *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité* IV (Paris 1960) 628-642, defines encratism, "self-control", as both a tendency and a sect. The renunciation of this world, expressed through abstinence from meat, wine, marriage, and property, was a tendency which can be seen even in the Catholic Church. Encratism also was a widespread sectarian phenomenon in the Orient, as is evidenced by the doctrines of Tatian, Julius Cassianus, and others commented on in the third book of Clement of Alexandria's *Stromata*. See also G. Quispel, The Study of Encratism: A Historical Survey, in U. Bianchi (ed.), *La Tradizione dell'Enkrateia*, Atti del Colloquio Internazionale—Milano 20-23 Aprile 1982 (Rome 1985) 35-81.

We defend the position that the *Gospel of Thomas* is not gnostic but encratite in nature, as are several other Nag Hammadi manuscripts (*e.g.*, the *Exegesis on the Soul*, the *Book*

of Thomas the Contender, and the *Sentences of Sextus*). The encratite character of the *Gospel of Thomas* has been attributed by G. Quispel to one of the sources which the author of the *Gospel of Thomas* espoused when composing this text. Quispel argues persuasively that the author also used a Jewish Christian gospel and a Hermetic source; see now his article, The *Gospel of Thomas* Revisited, in B. Barc (ed.), *Colloque international sur les Textes de Nag Hammadi*, Bibliothèque Copte de Nag Hammadi, "Études" 1 (Québec and Louvain 1981) 218-266. M. Lelyveld, *Les Logia de la Vie dans L'Evangile selon Thomas*, Nag Hammadi Studies XXXIV (Leiden 1987), also is an advocate of the encratite character of this gospel.

[6] MacDonald, 23-25, wants to derive this notion from Greek tradition, especially that of the Orphic/Platonic school. However, the comparison of the body to a garment is also found in Indian-Iranian tradition; see S. L. Wikander, *Vayu* (Lund 1941) 42-47; G. Widengren, *The Great Vohu Manah and the Apostle of God*, Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift 1945:5 (Uppsala & Leipzig 1945) 18, 36-37, 39 *et passim*.

In Iranian tradition, there is also mention of shedding the bodily garment. This occurs upon ascension to heaven. For instance, in the story of Zarathustra's call (*Denkart* VII, 2, 60-61), Zarathustra puts off his bodily garment and ascends to heaven in ecstasy; see C. Salemann, *Manichaeische Studien* (Petersburg 1908) 130-131; Widengren, 60-61. Another work (*Datastan i Denik* 37,33) describes "the flesh" as "the garment of the visible world"; see Widengren, 51.

[7] See L. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews* V (Philadelphia 1925) 97 n. 69; B. Murmelstein, Adam, ein Beitrag zur Messiaslehre, *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 35 (1928) 255 n. 3; W. Staerk, *Die Erlösererwartung in den östlichen Religionen* (Stuttgart and Berlin 1938) 11.

[8] For the primordial man being clothed with a glorious garment, see already Ezek. 28,13. Some Rabbinic texts take this to be a description of Adam; see, *e.g.*, *Pesikta* 36b. For further references to the luminous garment of Adam and Eve, see Ginzberg, *loc. cit.*; Murmelstein, *loc. cit.*; Staerk, 11-12. For additional evidence from Christianity, especially in the East, see G. Quispel, *Makarius, das Thomasevangelium und das Lied von der Perle*, Supplements to Novum Testamentum XV (Leiden 1967) 30-1, 57-60; S. Brock, Clothing Metaphors as a Means of Theological Expression in Syriac Tradition, *Typus, Symbol, Allegorie bei den östlichen Vätern und ihren Parallelen im Mittelalter*, Eichstätter Beiträge 4 (Regensburg 1982) 14, 23. In a transferred sense, the first covering of Adam and Eve was said to be one of righteousness or good deeds; see *Apoc. Mos.* 20,1-3; *Shabb.* 14a; *Meg.* 32a; *Gen. R.* 19,6. Iren. *Adv. haer.* 3,23,5 speaks of a "robe of sanctity." *Cf.* Tert. *De pud.* 9.

[9] There was also a tradition to the effect that the verbs in Gen. 3,21 should be taken as pluperfects, referring to the status of Adam and Eve *before* the Fall, and that the verse spoke of their robe of glory. Thus *Gen. R.* 20,12 says that the scroll of R. Meir (*a tanna* of the third generation) read *ʾwr*, "light", instead of *ʿwr*, "skin". This wording is presupposed by both Targums, which read "garments of glory (*yqʾr*)". Brock, 29 n. 13, also refers to the Peshitta version of Ps. 8,6 which reads that God *clothed* man with "honor and glory", whereas all other versions have "crowned."

[10] A few New Testament texts speak about putting off "the body of flesh" (Col. 2,11) or "the old nature" (Col. 3,9; Eph. 4,22) in baptism, but this phraseology has solely a moral significance; see P. W. van der Horst, Observations on a Pauline Expression, *New Testament Studies* 19 (1973) 181-187. Moreover, there is no indication that the metaphor was symbolized by the removal of the clothes.

[11] 64,19 (CSEL 54, 610). See J. Quasten, A Pythagorean Idea in St. Jerome, *American Journal of Philology* 63 (1942) 207, for a translation and interpretation of this passage.

[12] For Church Fathers subsequent to Jerome, refer to Smith, 222-233.

[13] See The Coptic-Gnostic Gospel according to Philip and Its Sacramental System, *Numen* 7 (1960) 192-193. Smith, 220, cites this work.

[14] H. G. Gaffron, *Studien zum koptischen Philippusevangelium unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Sakramente* (Diss., Bonn 1969) 69-70, suggested the second half of the second century. W. Isenberg, in the introduction to the translation in J. M. Robinson (ed.), *The Nag Hammadi Library in English* (revised edition; San Francisco 1988) 141, now speaks of the second half of the third century. G. Quispel, Genius and Spirit, in M. Krause (ed.), *Essays on the Nag Hammadi Texts In Honour of Pahor Labib*, Nag Hammadi Studies VI (Leiden 1975), has suggested that the *Gospel of Philip* "may have been composed about the time during which Tertullian wrote" against the Valentinians (166). In *Adv. Valent.* 4, it is said that Axionicus of Antioch remained faithful to the original doctrine of Valentinus. Since *Philip* does seem to reproduce the teachings of Valentinus, Quispel concludes that *Philip* was written in the *first* part of the third century. An Antiochene background for *Philip* has been argued by E. Segelberg, The Antiochene Background of the Gospel of Philip, *Bulletin de Société d'Archéologie Copte* 18 (1966) 205-23. Cf. Isenberg, 141.

[15] 66, 16-20 (Layton [ed.], *Nag Hammadi Codex II, 2-7* 172).

[16] Cf. 73,3-5: "If they do not first receive the resurrection while they live, when they die they will receive nothing" (Layton, 188). The text goes on to say that it is not baptism but the unction which conveys the resurrection. Thus, it may be that the removal of the clothes *before the anointing* could be seen as a prefiguration of the stripping off of the flesh, since this was the sacrament which conferred the resurrection.

[17] 75,21-25 (Layton, 192).

[18] For Christian evidence that baptism is a "garment" (ἔνδυμα), refer to J. Daniélou, Catéchèse Pascale et retour au Paradis, *Maison-Dieu* 45 (1956) 115. See now also the *Tripartite Tractate* (NHC I, 5) 128,20-25; 129,3-5. The Mandaeans believe that the water of baptism is an investiture with light garments; see K. Rudolph, *Die Mandäer* II, Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 75 (Göttingen 1961) 181-86.

[19] This was suggested already by G. Quispel, The Gospel of Thomas and the New Testament, *Vigiliae Christianae* 11 (1957) 13. Since *Thomas* is made up of different sources, the individual logia are of course older. Some of them may contain words of Jesus. H. Koester, One Jesus and Four Primitive Gospels, in J. Robinson and H. Koester (eds.), *Trajectories through Early Christianity* (Philadelphia 1971) 158-204, proposes that the basis of *Thomas* is a very primitive sayings collection which predates Q and was later incorporated into Q.

[20] An Edessene origin of the *Gospel of Thomas* was suggested by H.-Ch. Puech, Une collection des paroles de Jésus récemment retrouvée: L'Evangile selon Thomas, *Comptes-Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 1957, 155. See now the introduction to the Gospel of Thomas by B. Blatz in W. Schneemelcher (ed.), *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen* I (Tübingen 1987) 95, citing some of the supportive literature in n. 23.

[21] See Die Oden Salomos und die Polemik mit den Markioniten im syrischen Christentum, *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 205 (Symposium Syriacum 1976, 1978) 39-55. Drijvers' work appears to be unknown to J. M. Charlesworth, who does not cite it in his

introduction to the *Odes* in his edition, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* 2 (Garden City, New York 1985) 725-734.

[22] See *op. cit.* 57, citing Segelberg, "In the Odes there are a good many references to baptismal ritual which enable us to reconstruct a good deal of the baptismal ritual of the Odes" (The Baptismal Rite according to some of the Coptic-Gnostic Texts of Nag-Hammadi, in F. L. Cross [ed.], *International Conference on Patristic Studies*, Texte und Untersuchungen 80, Studia Patristica 5 [Berlin 1962] 118).

[23] 11,10-12 (M. Lattke [ed. and trans.], *Die Oden Salomos in ihrer Bedeutung für Neues Testament und Gnosis* I, Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 25/1 [Fribourg and Göttingen 1979] 108 [text] and 109 [translation]).

[24] 21,3-4 (Lattke, 131 [text] and 132 [translation]).

[25] 25,8-9 (Lattke, 150, 152 [text] and 151, 153 [translation]).

[26] 11,6-7 speaks about drinking living water, a phrase which could be applied to baptism by both the Church Fathers and the Gnostics; see G. W. H. Lampe, *The Seal of the Spirit* (London 1951) 111 n. 2; Rudolph, 125-27, 384-5, 386, 389-90. However, if this is an allusion to baptism, then verses 10-11 can not speak about a symbolic removal of clothes *before* baptism!

[27] See *The Odes of Solomon*, Texts and Studies 8/3 (Cambridge 1912) 72, 78, 90, 167. The *Odes* declare that the elect "put on" (*lbš*) God's "love" (3,1b; 23,3), his "grace" (4,6; 20,7), the savior himself (7,4; cf. Gal. 3,7), "holiness" (13,3), "incorruptibility through His Name" (15,8), "light" (21,3), "joy" (23,1), the "Perfect Virgin" (33,12), and "the Name" (39,8).

[28] J. Rendel Harris and A. Mingana (eds. and trans.), *The Odes and Psalms of Solomon* 2 (Manchester 1920) 197.

[29] V. 6 (Lattke, 82 [text] and 83 [translation]).

[30] For milk and honey as a description of the eucharist victuals, see J. Daniélou, *The Theology of Jewish Christianity* (trans. and ed. by J. A. Baker; London 1964) 332-334.

[31] V. 8 (Lattke, 176 [text] and 177 [translation]).

[32] For this conception, see P. Lundberg, *La typologie baptismale dans l'ancienne église*, Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis 10 (Uppsala 1942) 73ff.

[33] See vv. 19 and 22 (Lattke, 100, 102 [text] and 101, 103 [translation]).

[34] Compare 7,2-3 and 9,4 with 14,1 and 22,4.

[35] For descriptions of the order of initiatory rites in Syrian Christianity, refer to T. W. Mason, Miscellanea Apocalyptica III, *Journal of Theological Studies* 48 (1947) 59; *idem*, Entry into Membership of the Early Church, *Journal of Theological Studies* 48 (1947) 25-33; R. Murray, *Symbols of Church and Kingdom: A Study in Early Syriac Tradition* (Cambridge 1975) 21. The evidence is stated in full by D. Connolly, *The Liturgical Homilies of Narsai,* Texts and Studies VIII/1 (Cambridge 1916) xlii-xlix.

[36] See, *e.g.*, chs. 26-27. For the "seal" in the Acts, see F. J. Dölger, *Sphragis*, Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums 5 (Paderborn 1911) 95-98.

[37] Ch. 157 (W. Wright [ed.], *Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles* I [London and Edinburgh 1871] 374, and *idem* [trans.], *Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles* II [London and Edinburgh 1871] 289; M. Bonnet [ed.], *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha* II/2 [Leipzig 1903] 267).

[38] Wright, I 193, and II 166; Bonnet, 142.

[39] Wright, I 302, and II 267; Bonnet, 240.

[40] Connolly, 40. For the seal of the Name in Syrian Christianity, see further J. E. Fossum, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 36 (Tübingen 1985) 98-103.

[41] See also *Did. Apost.* ch. 16; *Apost. Const.* 33,16,2-3.

[42] See 1 Sam. 16,13; Isa. 61,1; Luk 4,18; Acts 10,38. In *Ode* 33,12 the "Perfect Virgin" admonishes people to don her. Bernard took the Virgin to be the Church, since the Church is described as a "Virgin" in the *Shepherd of Hermas* (*Vis.* 4). But note that Hermas identifies the Church and the Spirit (*Sim.* 9,1,1). In *Similitude* 9,13,2, the believers are said to clothe themselves with the clothing of the "virgins", who are identified as the "holy Spirits" (cf. 9,17,4). In *Similitude* 9,24,2, the white robe given to the one entering the Church is identified as the Spirit. The *Pseudo-Clementines* teach that the believers are vested with the "divine spirit" (*Hom.* 8,22).

[43] For material in the heresiological literature, see Rudolph, 384-387; G. Widengren, Baptism and Enthronement in some Jewish-Christian Gnostic Documents, in S. G. F. Brandon (ed.), *The Saviour God*, Comparative Studies in the Concept of Salvation Presented to Edwin Oliver James (Manchester 1963) 205-217. References to heavenly baptism in the Nag Hammadi collection remain to be described systematically. The author of *Zostrianos* (NHC VIII,1) 4,21-28 describes a heavenly baptism which he received after having cast his body upon the earth. Cf. *Trimorphic Protennoia* (NHC XIII,1) 48,6-20. E. Peterson, Die "Taufe" im Acherusischen See, *Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis* (Rome, Freiburg and Vienna 1959) 310-32, discusses the idea of heavenly baptism after death.

[44] V. 11.

[45] V. 16a (Lattke, 110 [text] and 111 [translation]). The rest of the *Ode* describes Paradise. In *Ode* 20,7, the Odist admonishes people to "put on the grace of the Lord generously, and come into His Paradise" (Lattke, 130 [text] and 131 [translation]). As has been seen above, pp. 125-6, "grace" is a term for unction in *Ode* 4,6.

In *Ode* 11, 12, the Odist says that he was given "rest" after having stripped off the body and been given a new "garment". In the Adamic literature, Adam requests to be anointed so that he may attain "rest"; see *Life of Adam and Eve* ch. 36; *Apocalypse of Moses* 9,3. In the *Pseudo-Clementine Homilies*, the "true prophet" is anointed with "grace" and thereby attains "rest" (3,20). For Paradise as a resting-place, see O. Hofius, *Katapausis. Die Vorstellung vom endzeitlichen Ruheort im Hebräerbrief*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 11 (Tübingen 1970) 59-74.

[46] Vv. 6-7 (Lattke, 132 [text] and 133 [translation]).

[47] In *Ode* 36, the Odist begins by relating that the Spirit, which was the divine power conveyed by unction, raised him to heaven and caused him to be standing before the face of God. Here he praised the Lord, having been made the greatest of the sons of God, *i.e.*, the angels (vv. 1-4). The Odist also says, "He anointed me with perfection, and I became one of those who are near him" (v. 6 [Lattke, 170 (text) and 171 (translation)]). Thus it appears that an anointing was associated with the ascent to heaven and transformation into an angelic figure.

[48] *Quaest. in Gen.* 1,53 (R. Marcus [ed. and trans.], *Philo*, Supplement I, The Loeb Classical Library [London and Cambridge, Mass., 1929] 30-31).

[49] *Leg. all.* 2,55; 56 (F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker [ed. and trans.], *Philo* I, The Loeb Classical Library [London and Cambridge, Mass., 1929 and reprints] 258-259). Cf. MacDonald, 28, who uses this passage as well as *De somn.* 1,43 and *Quod Deus sit imm.* 56 (see below) to demonstrate that "Philo's favorite image for the body is the garment"; he does not acknowledge, however, the connections between stripping the body and ascending to heaven in these passages. In pp. 28-29, however, he does discuss several other texts

which speak of the separation of the soul from the body and the soul's subsequent *ascent* to a higher realm.

[50] *Leg. all.* 2,54 (*ibid.*, 258-259).

[51] *Quod Deus sit imm.* 56 (F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker [ed. and trans.], *Philo* III, The Loeb Classical Library [London and New York 1929 and reprints] 38-39). Cf. MacDonald, 28.

[52] *De somn.* 1,43 (F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker [ed. and trans.], *Philo* V, The Loeb Classical Library [London and New York 1929 and reprints] 316-19). MacDonald, 28 n. 40, cites additional texts from Philo which speak of the soul "stripping" itself of the body (note that his reference to *Leg. all.* 57-58 should read 2,57-58).

[53] *De somn.* 1,43-44 (*ibid.*, 316-19). There are several other discussions about the wise ascending to heaven in which Philo describes the body in analogous language. Often these descriptions of ascensions accompany references to "seeing" God. For the most part, these references to "seeing" God will be reserved for discussion later in this paper; see section 3a.

[54] 136-137 (F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker [ed. and trans.], *Philo* II, The Loeb Classical Library [London and New York 1929 and reprints] 406-409). Note that in *Leg. all.* 3,69, Philo equates the following expressions: the body (σῶμα), leathern bulk (δερμάτινον ὄγκον), corpses (νεκρόν), and a dead thing (τεθνηκὸς αἰεί).

[55] *De post. Caini* 136 (*ibid.*, 406-407).

[56] *De somn.* 1,36 (*Philo* V, 312-315).

[57] *Leg. all.* 3,46-47 (*Philo* I, 330-333).

[58] *De gig.* 54 (*Philo* II, 470-473).

[59] Cf. *Gospel of Truth* (NHC I,3) 20,29-34 where this was first accomplished by Jesus at his resurrection. Jesus' resurrection is described in terms which define his material existence as a time during which he was clothed in mortality; his resurrection and subsequent ascension to God are described as the process of stripping off the mortal body and donning immortality. This type of exegesis of Gen. 3,21 reflects a new understanding of the Adam story: through the resurrection, Jesus becomes the first to return to the pre-Fall state of Adam when he was clothed in glory.

Some texts teach that at death, the individual would remove his "garment" and ascend to heaven; see, *e.g.*, *Acts of Thomas* ch. 147; *Coptic Manichean Psalm-Book* 81,8-9. Logion 21 of the *Gospel of Thomas* has also been interpreted along these lines; the logion reads: "Mary said to Jesus, 'Whom are Your disciples like?' He said, 'They are like children who have settled in a field which is not theirs. When the owners of the field come, they will say, "Let us have back our field." They (will) undress in their presence in order to let them have back their field and to give it back to them.' " H.-M. Schenke in J. Leipoldt and H.-M. Schenke, *Koptisch-gnostische Schriften aus den Papyrus-Codices von Nag Hammadi* (Hamburg-Bergstedt 1960) 14 n. 2, has interpreted the field as the cosmos and the owners of the field as the *archontai*, and, furthermore, equated the stripping of the garments with death. R. M. Grant and D. N. Freedman, *The Secret Sayings of Jesus* (London 1960) 134, agree that the garments are the body. G. Quispel, *Makarius, das Thomasevangelium und das Lied von der Perle*, Supplements to Novum Testamentum XV (Leiden 1967) 54, compares log. 21 to a passage in the *Shepherd of Hermas* where the Christians are described as strangers in the world: the "Lord of the land" is the devil; Christians have to leave the "land" owned by him (*Sim.* 1,4). Since death is not mentioned in log. 21, it is probable that the text simply states that if the believer wishes to

ascend to heaven, it is necessary to leave behind the world (field) and the physical body (clothes). Cf. below, p. 134.

[60] M. E. Thrall, "Putting on" or "Stripping off" in 2 Corinthians 5:3, in E. J. Epp and G. D. Fee (eds.), *New Testament Textual Criticisms: Its Significance for Exegesis, Essays in Honour of Bruce M. Metzger* (Oxford 1981) 221-237, has convincingly argued that the evidence favors the reading ἐνδυσάμενοι in 2 Cor. 5,3 rather than ἐκδυσάμενοι as the third edition of the *Greek New Testament* (United Bible Societies) has printed.

[61] The *Gospel of Philip* 56,26-57,22 is also involved in the debate over the body and the resurrection, and most likely bases its interpretation of the resurrection on 1 Cor. 15,35ff. This gnostic "gospel" states that there was a group of Christians who contended that they would rise in the flesh because they were afraid to be naked. Those who would rise in the body, the *Gospel of Philip* responds, are those who actually would be naked. It is those who unclothe themselves who are not naked. The *Gospel of Philip* concurs with Paul in that the believer will be clothed in spiritual bodies, maintaining that the believer who partakes in the eucharist, will have received "Jesus' flesh" as a clothing in which to arise.

[62] J. H. Charlesworth, in the introduction to this text in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* 2 (New York 1985) 444-445, dates this portion of the text to the second century C.E. or earlier.

[63] 5,3 (Syriac text [translation in Charlesworth, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* 2, 456]). See also the Greek text in J. H. Charlesworth (ed. and trans.), *The History of the Rechabites* I (The Greek Recension), Texts and Translations 17 (Chico 1982) 32 (text) and 33 (trans), which reads: "For you are wearing the skins of the sheep of the earth, and these perish with your body..." This blessed one speaking then appears as a gigantic being. Cf. the transfiguration of Jesus in the *Acts of John* ch. 90, where Jesus is both *naked* and of enormous stature. Note that the ascension of the mountain is an ascension to *heaven*. Refer to J. Fossum's forthcoming article, *Iesus nudus*: The Transfiguration of Jesus in the Acts of John.

[64] 12,3 (Syriac text [translation in Charlesworth, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* 2, 456-457]). See also Charlesworth, *The History of the Rechabites* I, 68 (text) and 69 (translation) for the Greek recension, which reads: "And we are not naked of body, as indeed you foolishly suppose, for we have the garment of immortality, and we are not ashamed before each other." Compare this text to the *Gospel of Philip* 56,26ff.; see above, n. 61.

[65] 11,2 (Syriac text [translation in Charlesworth, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* 2, 456]). See also the Greek text in Charlesworth, *The History of the Rechabites* I, 64 (text) and 65 (translation) which reads: "For also we are pious, but not immortal."

[66] 7,11 (Syriac text [translation in Charlesworth, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* 2, 453]). See also the Greek text in Charlesworth, *The History of the Rechabites* I, 46 (text) and 47 (translation), where Zosimos addresses the Blessed Ones as "my lords" (κύριοί μου) rather than "Earthly Angels". The Greek recension, however, understands the Blessed Ones to be like angels; see 5,4 where a Blessed One is described as "a son of God" whose "face (was) like the face of an angel".

[67] 7,2 (Syriac text [translation in Charlesworth, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* 2, 452]). The Greek recension is silent regarding this reference to the Blessed Ones being like Adam and Eve before they sinned; see Charlesworth, *The History of the Rechabites* I, 38 (text) and 39 (translation). But see next note.

[68] 12,3 (Syriac text [translation in Charlesworth, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* 2, 457]). The Greek recension in Charlesworth, *The History of the Rechabites* I, 68 (text) and

69 (translation) reads: "for we have the garment of immortality, and we are not ashamed before each other.' The shamelessness of the Blessed One alludes to the pre-Fall situation of Adam and Eve; cf. below, sections 1d and 2b.

[69] 11,6-8 (Syriac text [translation in Charlesworth, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* 2, 456]). See also the Greek text in Charlesworth, *The History of the Rechabites* I, 66 (text) and 67 (translation). In the (*Second*) *Apocalypse of James* (NHC V, 4), it is said that Jesus "was the virgin" and "was naked, and there was no garment clothing him" (58,18 and 21-23 [A. Veilleux (ed.), *Des Deux Apocalypses de Jacques*, Bibliothèque Copte de Nag Hammadi, "Textes" 17 (Québec 1986) 147]).

[70] 3,21-22.

[71] Ch. 20.

[72] Smith, 223, does note the allusion to Genesis, but links log. 37 with the Adam imagery in the baptismal homilies of Cyril of Jerusalem (ca. fourth century) and Theodore of Mopsuestia (ca. fifth century). Earlier texts where the Genesis reference is found, however, are not baptismal. We will return to the notion of "shamelessness" below; see section 2b.

[73] See J. Quasten, Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Exorcism of the Cilicium, *Harvard Theological Review* 35 (1942) 209-219. Quasten, 211-212, notes that Augustine is also a witness to this pre-baptismal ceremony, but because *Thomas* is much earlier and has a Syrian provenance, these Augustinian texts are not important to our discussion.

[74] Smith, 224.

[75] See An Ancient Syriac Baptismal Liturgy in the Syriac Acts of John, *Novum Testamentum* 6 (1963) 222, and nn. 5 and 6.

[76] *Ibid.*, 222.

[77] *Jew. Ant.* 2,9,7. Cited by Lelyveld, 85-86. Cf. Hermas, *Sim.* 9,32 where the believers are admonished not to trample the Lord's mercy underfoot.

[78] No. CCLXXVIII (C. R. C. Allberry [ed. and trans.], *A Manichaean Psalm-Book*, Manichaean Manuscripts in the Chester Beatty Collection II/2 [Stuttgart 1938] 99, lines 26-27). It is not improbable that this passage from the *Manichaean Psalm-book* is actually an explication of logion 37 itself, since Mani and his disciples would seem to have drawn upon the *Gospel of Thomas*; see H.-Ch. Puech, in E. Hennecke (ed.), *New Testament Apocrypha* I, new edition by W. Schneemelcher, English Translation ed. by R. McL. Wilson (London 1963 and 1973) 283-284. That Mani used the *Gospel of Thomas* is entirely comprehensible, since, as we now know, he grew up in a Jewish Christian sect. This was already stated by Ibn al-Nadim (*Fihrist* 9,1) and is now borne out by the *Cologne Mani Codex*. For this discussion, see G. Quispel, Mani, the Apostle of Jesus Christ, *Epektasis. Mélanges patristiques offerts au Cardinal Jean Daniélou* (Paris 1972) 667-672; Jewish Gnosis and Mandaean Gnosticism, in J.-E. Menard (ed.), *Les textes de Nag Hammadi*, Nag Hammadi Studies VII (Leiden 1975) 108-112; F. Decret, *Mani* (Paris 1974) 48-55; K. Rudolph, Die Bedeutung des Kölner Mani-Codex für die Manichäismusforschung, *Mélanges d'histoire des religions offerts à Henri-Charles Puech* (Paris 1974) 471-486; Antike Baptisten, *Sitzungsberichte Leipzig*, phil.-hist. Kl. 1214 (Berlin 1981) 13-17; L. Cirillo, *Elchasai e gli Elchasaiti* (Cosenza 1984).

[79] 40,11-17 (J. Ménard, *L'Exposé Valentinien. Les Fragments sur le Baptême et sur l'Eucharistie*, Bibliothèque copte de Nag Hammadi, "Textes" 14 [Québec 1985] 56 [text] and 57 [translation]). In general, unction seems to have been more important than baptism in gnosticism; refer to Rudolph, *Gnosis* 228-29. The Nag Hammadi fragment above seems

to presuppose that unction precedes baptism since this very fragment is followed by two fragments on baptism.

[80] MacDonald, 61-62, notes this passage and the preceding passage in reference to "trampling on the powers of darkness." However, he incorrectly uses it as evidence for the pre-baptismal ceremony of exorcism. Baptism is not mentioned at all.

[81] 97,2-10 (R. Bullard, *The Hypostasis of the Archons*, Patristische Texte und Studien 10 [Berlin 1970] 40-41). We are reminded here of the *Odes of Solomon*, where unction gives the power to ascend; see above, p. 128.

[82] *Strom.* 3, 13, 92 (O. Stählin [ed.], *Clemens Alexandrinus, Werke* II, Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte 15, new edition by L. Früchtel [Berlin 1962] 238). MacDonald, 30-39, argues that this passage is reminiscent of Gen. 1-3: the garment of shame refers to the "coats of skins" in Gen. 3,21, behind the notion of two becoming one is Gen. 2,24, and Gen. 1,27 is in the background of "neither male and female". Thus MacDonald concludes that the garment of shame is the body, and the two becoming one and "neither male and female" means a return to the primordial sexless androgyne. He, however, incorrectly understands the "performative setting" of this "Dominical Saying" to be baptism; see especially 50-63.

[83] For a similar view of the shamefulness of intercourse, see *Acts of Thomas* ch. 14, which tells of a bride who is unashamed, because she has taken to herself the "incorruptible Bridegroom"; she cries out, "the veil of corruption is taken away from me; and that I am not ashamed, (is) because the deed of shame has been removed far from me...and that this deed of corruption is despised by me, and the spoils of this wedding-feast that passes away, (is) because I am invited to the true wedding-feast; and that I have not had intercourse with a husband, the end whereof is bitter repentance, (is) because I am betrothed to the true Husband" (Wright, I, 182-183, and II, 157; Bonnet, 120). The notion that sexual intercourse was to be associated with the Fall was not uncommon in Christian circles; see Tert. *De monog.* 5; Iren. *Adv. haer.* 3,23,5; *Acts of Thomas* chs. 43-44; Ephrem, *In Gen. et in Exod.* ch. 30; John of Damascus, *De fide orthodoxa* 4,2; *Liber Graduum* 20,6.

[84] In fact, T. Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons* II/2 (1892) 634, suggests that this passage should be translated: "when...would come to pass."

[85] 12,1-2 (K. Lake [ed. and trans.], *The Apostolic Fathers* I, The Loeb Classical Library [London and Cambridge, Mass., 1912 and reprints] 146-147). A quite similar saying is found in the *Gospel of Thomas* log. 22. Cf. also *Acts of Peter* ch. 38; *Acts of Philip* ch. 140. W. Meeks, The Image of the Androgyne: Some Uses of a Symbol in Earliest Christianity, *History of Religions* 13 (1974) 207, may be right that Gal. 3,27-28 shows that the difference of gender was dissolved in baptism, but Davies, 132, is not justified in his opinion that this holds true also for *Thomas* log. 22. Whatever the relation between Gal. 3,28 and *Thomas*, logia 22 and 37 are closer to the passages in the *Gospel of the Egyptians* and *2 Clement*, where the setting is eschatological and not baptismal.

[86] See now Blatz, 97.

[87] Quispel, *Thomas* Revisited 265, attributes both these logia to the *Gospel of the Egyptians* "or another Encratite source". In logion 4, which Quispel also wants to assign to the encratite source, it is said that an old man may ask "a small child seven days old about the place of life" in order to live.

[88] See Bemerkungen zum Hamburger Papyrus-Fragment der Acta Pauli, *Frühkirche* 195.

[89] *Adv. haer.* 3,22,4 (A. Stieren [ed.], *Irenaeus, Adversus haereses* 2 [Leipzig 1853] 545).

[90] *Demonstratio* ch. 12 (J. Smith [ed. and trans.], *St. Irenaeus, Proof of the Apostolic Preaching*, Ancient Christian Writers 16 [London 1952] 56).

[91] *Ad Autolycum* 2,25 (R. M. Grant [ed. and trans.], *Theophilus of Antioch ad Autolycum*, Oxford Early Christian Texts [Oxford 1970] 66 [text] and 67 [translation]).

[92] *Prot.* 11,111,1 (C. Mondésert [ed. and trans.], *Clément d'Alexandrie, Le Protreptique.* Sources Chrétiennes [Paris 1949] 179 [text] and 178 [translation]).

[93] H. Kee, "Becoming a Child" in the Gospel of Thomas, *Journal of Biblical Literature* 82 (1963) 307-314, does not know the tradition that Adam was an innocent child before the Fall, but takes a clue from the association in log. 22 of the idea of little children with that of the single one, which A. F. J. Klijn, The "Single One" in the Gospel of Thomas, *Journal of Biblical Literature* 81 (1962) 271-278, derives from Jewish speculation about Adam before the Fall. This "singleness" of Adam included asexuality. Thus Kee is able to interpret the image of little children as referring to "what Adam was in the beginning, a being of child*like* asexual innocence" (311; italics ours).

[93a] Smith, 234, notes the eschatological connotation, but does not explore the connection between the *question* and *the conditions of the answer.*

[94] It is surprising that Smith and his followers have not noted that there are a few texts which teach that the newly baptized were granted a vision of Christ; see *Acts of Peter* ch. 5; *Acts of Thomas* ch. 27 (Syriac text only). See further Peterson, Bemerkungen 193-196; A. F. J. Klijn, *The Acts of Thomas*, Supplements to Novum Testamentum V (Leiden 1962) 211-212. There can be no doubt, however, that this is an adaptation of the *visio dei* motif.

[95] See C. Rowland, *The Open Heaven* (London 1982).

[96] 13-14 (*Philo* II, 334-335).

[97] 7 (*Philo* V, 144-45).

[98] 9 (*ibid.*, 146-47).

[99] *De fuga.* 165 (*ibid.*, 100-101).

[100] *Ibid.* Cf. *De post. Caini* 169 (*Philo* II, 428-429).

[101] *Leg. all.* 3,52 (*Philo* I, 334-337).

[102] *Leg. all.* 3,49 (*ibid.*, 332-333).

[103] *Leg. all.* 3,54 (*ibid.*, 336-337).

[104] *Leg. all.* 3,42 (*ibid.*, 328-329).

[105] *Ibid.*

[106] F. I. Anderson in the introduction to 2 *Enoch* in Charlesworth (ed.), *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* 1 91, 94-97, suggests the late first century C.E. as a date for this text. We even venture to suggest a pre-70 date because 51,4 admonishes people to pray in the Temple three times daily. For this Jewish custom, see Dan. 6,11 and Acts 3,1.

[107] We will discuss the theme of being unafraid in the next section (3b).

[108] 2 *Enoch* 22,7-10.

[109] A second century C.E. date is given to the vision by M. A. Knibb, in the introduction to the work in Charlesworth, *Pseudepigrapha* 2 150.

[110] 7,5-8; 6,10-13; 8,11-14.

[111] 7,4-5.

[112] 7,5-6.

[113] 9,2.

[114] 9,9.

[115] 9,37.

[116] 11,35.

[117] 108-113 (Wright, I 274-279, and II 238-245; Bonnet 219-224).

[118] See Quispel, *Makarius* 57-60, who suggests that the concept of the robe derives from 2 Cor. 5,3. Cf. above, p. 130. MacDonald, 56, gives a similar interpretation of this hymn, but without citing Quispel.

[119] 9,1-2.

[120] 25,3.

[121] 26,1.

[122] 14,14-15.

[123] 14,15-21.

[124] 14,24.

[125] Chs. 22-24. Note that the anointing in this text takes place in heaven; the same is seen in *Ode* 36; see n. 47. What is important, however, is the common nexus of motifs: stripping, anointing, ascension, elimination of fear, and seeing God.

[126] See above, p. 128 with n. 47.

Department of Near Eastern Studies
The University of Michigan
3074 Frieze Building
Ann Arbor
Michigan 48109-1285
U.S.A.

Vigiliae Christianae 45 (1991), 151-183, E. J. Brill, Leiden

APOCALYPSE AND REDEMPTION IN EARLY CHRISTIANITY
FROM JOHN OF PATMOS TO AUGUSTINE OF HIPPO[1]

BY

PAULA FREDRIKSEN

Christianity began with the announcement that time and history were about to end.[2] This message, preserved variously in those documents that came to make up the New Testament, found its most flamboyant expression in the book that closes the Christian canon, the Apocalypse of John. John's vision of the final things—celestial disturbances, plagues and huge carnage; the persecution of the righteous by the whore of Babylon; the resurrection of the saints and their 1000-year reign with Christ—has long held pride of place in a paradoxically enduring tradition of millenarian apocalyptic expectation: the belief that Christ is about to return *soon* to establish his kingdom on earth.[3] As Christianity developed from its Jewish messianic origins into a central institution of late Roman imperial culture—as history, in other words, persistently failed to end on time—the church, of necessity, had to come to terms with its own foundational prophecy ('The kingdom of God is at hand!'), especially as this was embodied in the Book of the Apocalypse.

In the story of the Western church's efforts, Tyconius and Augustine hold pride of place. Earlier theologians had responded to the Apocalypse either by affirming the approach of the End while accounting for its delay, or by allegorizing any historical and temporal reference out of the prophecy, or by repudiating the text altogether. But Tyconius and, following him, Augustine introduced in the late fourth/early fifth century a reading of John that affirmed its historical realism while liberating it from the embarrassments of a literal interpretation. As we review these earlier responses, we can come to a clearer appreciation of the exegetical revolution[4] wrought by these two men; and as we measure its effects, both social and literary, on subsequent Latin Christianity, we measure as well the continuing power—and danger—of John's vision of the End.

Apocalypse and the Early Church

'The revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave him to show to his servants what must soon take place ... for the time is near' (Apoc 1:1,3). What John saw—perhaps in the 90s of the common era, during the reign of Domitian[5]—came heavily encoded in symbols, numbers, and obscure visions. The slain Jesus, appearing as a seven-horned, seven-eyed lamb (5:6-14), promises those killed for their witness that they will soon be avenged, once their full number is attained (6:9-11). Quakes rack the earth, stars fall, the sun blackens and the moon becomes like blood (vv. 12-15). One hundred and forty-four thousand martyrs, robed in white and 'washed in the blood of the Lamb' glory before the throne of God (7:1-17). Plagues ravage humankind for five months; the nations trample the holy city for forty-two months; they gaze upon the dead for three and a half days (9:5; 11:2, 8, 11). Terrible reptiles and beasts prey on the saints (12:1-16:21), while the great whore of Babylon, drunk on their blood, fornicates with the kings of the earth (ch. 17). Yet, finally, dramatically, Babylon is no more. An angel binds Satan as the martyrs wake at the first resurrection to rule with Christ for a thousand years (20:1-6). Fire from heaven consumes the evil Gog and Magog (vv. 7-10). All the dead are judged at the second resurrection (vv. 12-15). A new heaven and new earth appear with the descent of the heavenly Jerusalem, and death is no more (21:1-4). Spread this prophecy, urges John's angel, 'for the time is near.... Behold, I am coming soon.'

John's prophecy did spread. It reached Christian communities that could turn to authoritative Jewish scriptures,[6] as well as to the growing body of Christian ones, to flesh out their picture of life once the Kingdom came. Isaiah, Daniel, Jubilees and Baruch, sounding the great themes of Jewish restoration theology,[7] profoundly affected evolving Christianity. Irenaeus of Lyons (c. 200 CE) cites approvingly the teaching of Papias. This earlier father, a conduit of oral traditions going back to the first generation of apostles, proclaimed the approaching 'millennium after the resurrection, and a corporeal reign of Christ here on earth.'[8] According to Papias, who had it from the elders, who in turn had heard from John, the Lord himself had taught that 'the days will come when each vine will have a thousand branches, and each branch 10,000 twigs, and each twig 10,000 shoots, and on each shoot 10,000 clusters, and each cluster 10,000 grapes.'[9] Justin Martyr, appealing both to Isaiah and to the Apocalypse, spoke likewise of a coming period of

terrestrial superabundance, ubiquitous peace, and the thousand-year rule of the saints centered around the renewed Jerusalem.[10]

But when was 'soon'? How could one know? One way was to study the prophets' and evangelists' catalogue of apocalyptic disasters (persecutions, plagues, earthquakes, celestial and social disruption), and their cryptic descriptions of kings, armies, and empires, and see whether these matched the times. Particularly in periods of persecution, such interpretations, promising as they did the imminent vindication of those suffering, could be powerfully persuasive.[11] They were also pointedly political. John's apocalyptic Babylon, seated on seven mountains, is clearly Rome (17:9). Irenaeus sees in the fourth beast of Daniel 7 and the beast from the sea of Apoc 13 the 'imperium quod nunc regnat': the name of the two-horned earth-born beast, encoded in the numbers 666, is LATINUS. The 'mystery of iniquity,' the 'lawless one' foretold by 'Paul' (2 Thes 2:3-7), is the Emperor.[12] If this empire persecuted, then clearly the end of the age was at hand.

'Where is the promise of his coming?' complained some Christians in the early second century. 'For ever since the fathers fell asleep, all things have continued as they were from the beginning of creation' (2 Pt 3:4). 'Peter', to both console and exhort his congregation, recalled to them a line from Psalms: 'With the Lord, one day is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day' (2 Pt 3:8//Ps 90:4). This verse, together with the days of creation sketched in the opening verses of Genesis and the thousand-year reign of the saints promised in Apoc 20, became the church's support for a key eschatological concept: the cosmic week, or the ages of the world.[13] As God had created the world in six days, and rested on the seventh (Gen 1:3-2:3), and as a day to him is as a thousand years (Ps 90:4), so the world would exist for six ages of one thousand years each. Then, at the end of the sixth age, six thousand years since creation, Christ would return in glory to inaugurate the millennial Sabbath rest of his saints (Apoc 20:4-5). To know the time of the End, one had only to calculate the age of the world.

This approach to millenarianism, developed particularly in Christian chronography, permitted a traditional, historical interpretation of apocalyptic texts while at the same time gaining a control over the enthusiasms they inspired. The date of the year 6000 prevailing in Western tradition fell in the equivalent of *annus domini* 500: when Hippolytus and Julius Africanus, writing in the early third century, estimated that Christ had been born in the 5,500th year since creation,

they pushed the date of the Parousia well out of their own and their audiences' lifetimes.[14] In an age that saw the rise of the 'New Prophecy,' Montanism, when even Catholic bishops, firm in their belief that the End was upon them, urged their flocks to drastic action, such an exegetical strategy had much to recommend it.[15]

So did allegory. Many thinking Christians from the second century onward could not take seriously the proposition that lower, material reality was the proper arena of redemption.[16] Whether they held, as did Marcion and the various gnostic groups, that a lower god presided over the physical universe and thus that redemption in Christ, the son of the High God, was utterly spiritual;[17] or whether, as Origen, their grasp of the principles of philosophy made claims to physical redemption seem incoherent and ignorant, these Christians repudiated the idea of a fleshly resurrection and a kingdom of God on earth. Such people, complained Tertullian, understood death itself in a spiritual sense: not as the separation of body and soul, but as ignorance of God, 'by reason of which man is dead to God, and no less buried in error than he would be in the grave.' When, then, and what, is the resurrection? When they 'are with the Lord, once they have put him on in baptism.'[18] The wine that the saints will drink in the kingdom, explains Origen, is the wine of Divine Wisdom; the bread is the 'Bread of Life': these nourish the soul and enlighten the mind of the spiritual body.[19] Certain prophetic and dominical sayings, Origen concedes, might be construed as bespeaking an earthly and bodily redemption, but only if the interpreter failed to see that the force of such scriptures 'must be spiritual and figurative.'[20]

The church could not question the authority of the canonical prophets; at best, their millenarian passages could be allegorized. The Apocalypse, however, by comparison a recent comer to the canon, was vulnerable. When an Egyptian bishop, Nepos of Arsinoë, insisted in his treatise *On the Refutation of the Allegorists* on a more literal reading of Apocalypse, Origen's pupil Dionysius debated with his followers for three full days.[21] Returning to his see in Alexandria, Dionysius then wrote his own refutation of Nepos, entitled *On the Promises.* There he subjected the text of Apocalypse to rigorous linguistic and historical criticism. A holy and inspired man named John, Dionysius allowed, had indeed written the book, but he could not be that same John the apostle, the son of Zebedee and author of the gospel and the New Testament's Johannine epistles. The denial of apostolic authorship deprived the Apocalypse of much of its authority.[22]

Thus, by the early third century, Christians expressed a wide range of responses, social and literary, to the Apocalypse and the message it embodied. Some, like the bishops and their congregations in Pontus and Syria, actively anticipated the immediate arrival of an earthly Kingdom; others, generating world chronologies, carefully calculated the time of its arrival; others, most notably Origen, radically allegorized all millenarian texts; others, like Gaius of Rome and the mysterious Alogi, repudiated the text by ascribing authorship to the arch-heretic Cerinthus;[23] still others, like Dionysius and Eusebius, questioned its apostolic authority.

But with the events of 312, the political context of all these responses changed drastically. As a result of his victory, prompted by a vision, Constantine became the imperial patron of Christianity. From the perspective of John of Patmos, the Beast had entered the church.

Apocalypse in North Africa

North Africa was the 'bible belt' of the Mediterranean. At once severe and enthusiastic, fundamentalist and traditional in their biblical orientation and proud of their origins as the 'church of the martyrs', North African Christians gave to the Latin church its earliest acts of the martyrs[24] and most energetic cult of the saints. They buried their dead in wet plaster to preserve every detail of the body's outline; they could break into near riot if 'ivy' was substituted for 'gourd' in a reading from the prophet Jonah during a sermon.[25] The church's experiences in the drastic days of the Roman persecutions determined its view both of itself and of the outside world: it was the community of the holy, the ark of salvation sealed against the temptations and tempests of a hostile environment, a permanent option to pagan society. *Extra ecclesiam nulla salus.*[26]

This community was undergoing one of its characteristic upheavals in the wake of persecution at the moment when Constantine entered the church. The admired ideal and established ideology of martyrdom notwithstanding, many North African Christians had given way under the pressure of his predecessor's actions nearly a decade earlier. Through a series of edicts issued between 303 and 305 CE, Diocletian had sought to coerce the participation of ecclesiastics and, eventually, laymen in the *pax deorum*, the *entente cordiale* between heaven and earth that sustained the empire.[27] Christian clergy in particular were ordered to turn

their holy books over to posses of imperial soldiers. Those who complied would suffer no disability; those who refused, imprisonment and even death.

Many clergy did comply. Those who did not, clergy and lay, resented these *traditores*, challenged their ordinations, and insisted that they be restored to the church through rebaptism.[28] This last policy put local practice too much at odds with transmarine custom: in 313, finally, the Roman pope pronounced the re-baptizers guilty of schism. The rigorists subsequently lost their appeal to the newly-involved emperor. They were no longer Catholics: they were the Donatist Church.[29]

Despite imperial patronage, however, the Catholics were and remained a minority in North Africa up through the late fourth century. Both groups had equally dense episcopal bureaucracies,[30] but it was the Donatists who enjoyed strong local support: Catholicism was the import to Africa. And, despite occasional outbursts of violence, these North Africans married each other, bequeathed or inherited property to and from each other, and, in short, found ways to live with one another.[31] Beyond the social webbing of family and property relations, they were bound together by a shared Latin Christian culture.[32]

An uncomplicated millenarianism figured prominently in this culture. Late fourth-century North African Christians, as Christians elsewhere, continued to look forward to the approaching Kingdom on earth. Its due-date—worked out two centuries earlier by Julius Africanus, affirmed one century later by his compatriot Lactantius—was drawing near: in 397, the bishop Hilarianus reiterated that the year 6000 since the Creation was a scant century off.[33] If Catholics, despite the benefit of imperial patronage, so actively anticipated the coming End, how much more so did the Donatists who 'beneath the purple and scarlet robes of the apocalyptic whore ... could still recognize Rome'?[34]

The cult of the dead, energetically observed by both sides, provides extra-literary evidence of these enthusiasms. 'All Africa,' observed Augustine, 'is filled with holy bodies' (Ep. 78, 3), and to their shrines the faithful regularly repaired to feast, dance, and get splendidly drunk.[35] On the *laetitia* of the saint, people gathered to hear the martyr's *passio* and receive cures, while (as the word 'laetitia' suggests) thoroughly enjoying themselves and their *bons verres*.[36] Augustine, annoyed to distraction by such 'carnalis ingurgitatio,' complained to a colleague that these observances were pagan corruptions brought into the church with the influx of forced converts after 399.[37] Perhaps true:

pagans also feasted their dead at family gravesites. But in the abandon round the martyr's *mensa*, in the drinking and feasting of the faithful gathered at the shrine of the saint, we also glimpse ancient Christian hopes for life after the *prima resurrectio*:[38] an affirmation—moving, in a society where hard work, if one would eat, was unremitting; where social position, cemented as it was by civil legislation, was all but unmovable; and where starvation was never so very far away—that when the Kingdom came social distinctions would dissolve, life would be joy, labors would cease, the earth would yield its fruits in abundance, and God would wipe away every tear.

From this world, sometime in the closing decades of the fourth century, emerges the elusive figure of the lay Donatist theologian Tyconius. We know little about him, and his literary legacy—four known writings, of which all but one are lost—is exiguous.[39] Nonetheless, it is Tyconius who stands at the source of a radical transformation of African—and thus, ultimately, of Latin—theology, and whose reinterpretation of his culture's separatist and millenarian traditions provided the point of departure for what is most brilliant and idiosyncratic in Augustine's own theology.[40] And it is Tyconius, most precisely, whose own reading of John's Apocalypse determined the Western church's exegesis for the next eight hundred years.[41]

His commentary on Apocalypse no longer exists—or, perhaps more accurately, it lives on obscured in the penumbra of the later Catholic commentaries which drew on Tyconius even as they repudiated him.[42] Its literary vestiges attest to his remarkable originality: Tyconius championed a typological reading of this text that avoided the ahistoricism of allegory while insisting, against earlier Western apocalyptic commentary in general and the temperament and traditions of African Christianity, especially Donatism, in particular, that the time of the End and the identity of the saved could in no way be known.[43] The details of his exegetical argument are lost to us. Its logic, however, can be inferred from Tyconius' sole remaining work, the *Liber regularum*.[44]

The Law, says Tyconius (by which he intends both Old and New Testament), is mediated through seven rules. These rules are *mysticae*: they are the compositional principles of scripture, encoded in the text itself, which conceal or obscure its meaning.[45] Sometimes, for example, the Bible speaks of the Lord; other times, seeming to, it actually speaks of the Church, his body (Rule I, *de Domino et corpore eius*). And the Lord's Body is itself bipartite, *permixtum*: it is both 'black' and

'beautiful'; the good and the wicked both abide therein (Rule II, *de Domini corpore bipertito*). The Law *is* the Bible, and thus it encompasses God's promise; it speaks both to the period of Israel and to the period of the Church. Both Law and promise obtain at all times, and the Law works in the predestined to arouse faith (Rule III, *de promissis et lege*). Scripture can ambiguously express general truths through seemingly simple reference to particular persons and events (Rule IV, *de specie et genere*); naming periods of time quite precisely, it nonetheless resists calculation, for the numbers themselves are elastic, infinitely interpretable *mystica* (Rule V, *de temporibus*). Something as seemingly straightforward as narrative conceals complications: apparently sequential events may actually reiterate one another, so that what seems like sequence is really repetition (Rule VI, *de recapitulatione*). Even references to the devil are less than clear: when scripture speaks of Satan, it might well intend his 'body', those who follow him, the unrighteous (Rule VII, *de diabolo et eius corpore*; cf. Rule I).

By so complicating the biblical text, Tyconius gained a way to approach some of its most unabashedly apocalyptic and millenarian passages head-on, affirming their historical significance while obscuring their eschatological value. Rules I and VII, for example, enable him to insist with seeming simplicity that the Son of Man really will arrive seated at the right hand of power and coming on the clouds of heaven,[46] and that Gog and the 'mystery of lawlessness' really will be revealed in time of persecution:[47] but since these traditionally apocalyptic figures refer, according to Tyconius' hermeneutic, to the church and to the unrighteous within the church, respectively, their 'appearance' is within history, not at its edge. So also on the issue of persecution generally. Tyconius can agree with his Donatist colleagues that the suffering they now endure at the hands of Rome was indeed foretold in Daniel and in Apocalypse. Nonetheless, he insists, what currently occurs in Africa must take place *per orbem*: persecution itself does not indicate that the End is at hand.[48] Nor, until that hour, does it serve to identify the community of the righteous. In the meanwhile, the righteous and unrighteous must and will remain together, mixed, within the church.[49]

As with these typological figures and events, so with numbers and periods of time: their multiple referents defy easy categorization. In Rule V, sums long-favored in traditional millenarian calculation skitter across Tyconius' page: 6000 (the years of the age of the world), 1000 (the reign of the saints), seven, ten, twelve, 144,000 (the number of the

redeemed, Apoc 7:4), 1260 (days, Apoc 11:3), 42 (months, Apoc 11:2), 350 (years, derived from three and a half days, Apoc 11:11). Thanks to the principle of synecdoche—the whole for the part, and vice versa—Tyconius, with vertiginous ease, can stretch each of these so many different ways that any absolute numerical value evaporates.[50]

Scriptural numbers thus do not and cannot quantify: rather, they symbolize and indicate certain spiritual truths. 'Ten', for example, can signify either a perfect whole or a part representing a whole or a simple sum, and it has the same significance even if squared or further multiplied by itself.[51] Hence, though the world is to endure six days, or 6000 years, says Tyconius, and though humanity currently finds itself in the 'last day', since during this day 'the Lord was born, suffered, and rose again,' nonetheless, what is left of this last day is also called '1000 years'—more particularly, it is 'the thousand years of the first resurrection' during which the believer has received his 'spiritual body' through baptism. The Son of Man—that is, the Church—has come and, during this last day and final hour, risen from the dead; Satan is now bound, and the thousand-year reign of the saints progesses now, on earth, through the church.[52]

Tyconius likewise dissolves the gross periodization of 'Old' Dispensation and 'New'—rather, he instists that the important distinction is moral and spiritual rather than temporal. For, he argues, the dynamics of salvation, that subtle and mysterious interplay of grace, free will and divine foreknowledge, are constant across nations, times, and individuals: whether for Jacob or for the generation of the Babylonian Captivity, for Paul or for the contemporary believer, they remain the same.[53] As a process, then, salvation history is less linear than interior. And it is the Bible that stands as the historical annals of these interior events, the inspired record of God's saving acts. To understand the Bible is to understand the relation of prophecy, grace, and history; to understand, in brief, how God works in human time.[54]

Tyconius' reading of scripture thus emphasized the historical realization of prophecy while denying the sort of social and temporal transparency to the text that would allow for a millenarian interpretation. A radical agnosticism controls his estimate of both current events and traditional prophecies: neither persecution nor peace indicates God's ultimate time-table; and no exterior fact (like persecution), conforming to a church's view of itself as holy (hence persecuted), can actually confirm that view. The time of the End is unknowable in princi-

ple; and until it come, the church must remain a *corpus permixtum*, containing both sinner and saint.[55]

Augustine and the Apocalypse

Augustine himself had once been a millenarian, believing that the first resurrection, described in Apoc 20:1-6, would be bodily, and that the sabbatical rest of the saints after this resurrection would last for a thousand years.[56] Still, he later insisted, he had held even then that the saints' delights would be of a spiritual character, unlike 'those people' who asserted that the raised would 'spend their rest in the most unrestrained material feasts, in which there will be so much to eat and drink that those supplies will break the bounds not only of moderation, but also of credibility'—a fair description of the prophecy of superabundance found in Baruch, attributed to Jesus, repeated by Papias, Justin and Irenaeus, affirmed in Lactantius, and actively anticipated in the laetitiae observed by Catholic and Donatist alike.[57] When in the early years of his priesthood Augustine worked to reform the traditional observance of these festivals, to turn the 'carnales foeditates' of the martyr's banquet into a day of preaching and orderly congregational prayer, more than a question of Christian deportment was at stake: he sought to superimpose a vision of the reign of the saints, as previewed in these celebrations round their *memoriae*, that was fundamentally different—in his own terms, 'spiritual.'[58]

The years of Augustine's episcopacy coincided with a stream of dates and events within Africa and beyond that Christians could readily view as harbingers of the Kingdom.[59] Of these, Alaric's invasion of Rome in 410 was by far the most dramatic. 'Behold, from Adam all the years have passed,' some exclaimed, 'and behold, the 6000 years are completed, ... and now comes the day of judgment!'[60] The pious noted prodigies and watched for signs of the End. Spurred by a recent solar eclipse that had coincided with great drought and an earthquake, the bishop of Salona, Hesychius, inquired whether the faithful might now rejoice, as the evangelist Luke had urged, 'for redemption is at hand' (Lk 21:28). Hesychius, further, based his case on a fundamentally optimistic reading of recent Roman history. Since the emperors had become Christian, most of the signs of the approaching Parousia predicted in the gospels had been accomplished, and the gospel had been preached throughout the whole world (Mt 24:14).[61]

Against such sentiments Augustine argued tirelessly. He made commonsense observations: a specifically named deadline invites disappointment and lack of faith once it is past; and inferences cannot be drawn from wars and portents because wars and portents occur constantly, and Christians might thus be mocked 'by those who have read of more and worse things in the history of the world.'[62] He cited the evangelists: if Jesus himself preached that man was not to know the hour of the End (Acts 1:7), and taught that not even the Son, but only the Father, knew when it would be (Mk 13:32 and parr.), then human calculation was worse than dangerous: it was actually forbidden. Finally, armed with Tyconius' exegetical strategies, Augustine moved to confront the premier text of Christian millenarianism, the Apocalypse of John.

Augustine's most mature and measured statement of his position appears in Book XX of *De civitate Dei*. Asserting that belief in God's final judgment and the second coming of Christ is the standard of orthodoxy, he nevertheless immediately cautions against any facile understanding of the texts that bespeak such things (1,2). Jesus himself proclaims the coming Son of Man, the destruction of Jerusalem, the final judgment, and the end of the age; but, urges Augustine, many of these passages, culled from Matthew, are ambiguous. Upon examination, they turn out to refer 'to the coming of the Savior in the sense that he comes throughout this present age in the person of his church; ... the destruction may be only of the earthly Jerusalem', and so on.

Augustine refers his reader to his correspondence with Hesychius for an extended demonstration of how best to understand these evangelical passages (1,4). What concerns him here is the distinction between the first and second resurrections. The second resurrection, he asserts, is the resurrection of the body; as such, it can only occur at the end of the world (6,1). But the first resurrection occurs now: it is of the soul, which through its reception of baptism and life in the church is raised from the death of irreligion. The first resurrection, for the saints, brings life; the second, for all humankind, will bring judgment (6,1-2).[63] Having established this line of interpretation through an appeal to Matthew, the Gospel of John, and Paul's letters (1,5-6,2) Augustine then moves to discuss the actual scriptural source of the teaching on the double resurrection, John's Apocalypse.

> Then I saw an angel descending from heaven, holding in his hand the key of the abyss and a chain. He seized the dragon, that serpent of old, whose

> other names are the Devil and Satan, and he chained him up for a thousand years, and he threw him into the abyss, and shut it up and sealed it over him, so that he could no more lead astray the nations until the thousand years should be ended. After that he must be let loose for a short time.
>
> Then I saw thrones, and those who sat on them; and judgment was given. And the souls of those slain because of their witness to Jesus and because of the word of God, and those who had not worshiped the Beast and its image, or received its mark on their forehead or hand, these reigned with Jesus for a thousand years. But the rest of the dead did not come to life until the end of the thousand years. This is the first resurrection. Blessed and holy is the man who shares in this first resurrection. Over them the second death will have no power; but they will be priests of God and of Christ, and will reign with him for a thousand years.
>
> Apoc 20:1-6

This passage, explains Augustine, has been a seedbed of many materialist and millenarian misconceptions. Some people, assuming that the first resurrection would be bodily, have interpreted these verses together with 2 Pt 3:8//Ps 89:4 and, 'particularly excited about the number 1000', conjecture that there will be a millennium-long Sabbath rest of the saints at the end of the six ages ('days') of creation (7,1). What makes this incorrect understanding intolerable, Augustine complains, is its focus on material feasts and drinking. Declining (perhaps wisely, since such a reading of this text was so well established) to refute this interpretation directly, Augustine proceeds to explain how John should be read.

What might seem like final events have in fact, says Augustine, already been accomplished. With the first coming of Christ and the establishment of his church, for instance, the Devil has already been bound; that is, his power is bridled. 'For a thousand years' may indeed indicate that this binding is accomplished 'in the last thousand years, that is, in the sixth millennium, the sixth day' which accordingly should be understood to last one thousand years.[64] Or maybe not: '1000' is a perfect symbolic number, and thus might stand simply for 'totality' or 'all generations' (6,2).[65] Satan thus is bound until—not at—the end of the age. And 'bound' where—in what abyss? In the 'innumerable multitude of the impious, in whose hearts there is a great depth of malignity against the Church of God' (6,3).[66]

Thus Satan is bound and the church, ruled by its own enthroned authorities, reigns with Christ for the 'thousand years' (however long that might actually be) of his Kingdom, that period stretching from its

foundation to the end of the age (9,1-2). Both righteous and unrighteous dwell in this Kingdom, and will until the final judgment (9,2). This present period of mixed membership is nonetheless the thousand-year reign of the saints, however, because the martyrs, whose bodies have not yet been restored to them, rule spiritually with Christ in his church through their souls (9,2). Asserting this through his Tyconian reading of Apocalypse in Book XX, Augustine makes the case more creatively in Book XXII, where he closes his lengthy masterwork with a review of the miracles known to him and accomplished through the relics of the martyrs.[67] These miracles are energetic proof of the saints' power and manifest presence, evidence that they truly do reign 'now', in the age before the End. Thus these End-time events and more—Antichrist, Gog and Magog, the sea giving up its dead—Augustine, through Tyconius, can consistently de-eschatologize, transposing them back into the present, where they serve to describe the current experience of the church.

But Augustine's reliance on Tyconius was both more profound and more independent than this reiteration of the latter's exegetical strategies might imply. The long meditation on Paul begun in the 390s, when he had first encountered Tyconius, had led Augustine to formulate ideas on time and history as experienced objectively and culturally, on the one hand, and individually and subjectively, on the other, that radically departed from earlier views of salvation, and of salvation history. When turning to the Book of the Apocalypse, and thus concentrating on traditional Christian millenarianism, Augustine effectively altered the terms of the discussion.

In his earlier works on Genesis and on Paul's letter to the Romans, Augustine had drawn on two different periodizations of history: a seven-age model, on the analogy with the creational days, and a four-age model, emphasizing the Law and grace. The seven-age model coordinated periods of biblical history with humanity's spiritual progress toward redemption. The first five ages (demarcated by Adam, Noah, Abraham, David, and the Exile) pertained to the Old Testament; the sixth age began with the coming of Christ and would end with his Parousia; the seventh will be the millenarian Sabbath rest of the saints.[68] But in the 390s, Augustine moved quickly from an emphasis on the historical to the individual within this scheme: already in *De vera religione* (c. 389-90) he dropped the analogy to the days of creation, and concentrated on the seven spiritual ages of man.[69]

His four-age model, derived from Romans, begins on this note.

Paul's letter had implied a history of salvation, stretching from Adam 'before the Law' to the imminent redemption of humanity and indeed all creation at Christ's second coming.[70] Augustine schematized this history—*ante legem, sub lege, sub gratia*, and *in pace*—and related these stages to the development of the individual believer, who sins freely before knowing the Law, struggles not to once it is known, and succeeds in this struggle with the reception of grace. Man ceases to need to struggle against sin only with the transformation of his body in the fourth stage, when he will have perfect peace.[71]

Thus Augustine, as Tyconius before him, can argue that salvation history is both linear and interior.[72] Scriptural history and the individual's experience coincide at their shared extremes: birth in Adam, eschatological resurrection in Christ. What interests Augustine is the interior history, the anthropology which this scheme implies: how, given man's fallen nature, does one move *sub lege* to *sub gratia*? In the agitated stream of works on Paul produced in the mid- to late 390s, Augustine no sooner formulates an explanation for the dynamics of this crucial moment than he discards it.[73] Finally, in his brilliant, melancholy response to Simplicianus, meditating once again on Romans 7 and 9, Augustine arrived at an answer from which he never wandered: He does not know. If God can give grace to such an enthusiastic, flamboyant, unrepentant sinner as Saul, if he can hate Esau when Esau was still in the womb and therefore had done nothing to deserve either mercy or condemnation, then God is absolutely inscrutable, his ways 'past finding out'.[74]

God's opacity is matched by the individual's. Because of the great sin that marks the beginning of human history, man cannot know or control himself. Not only does his spirit struggle against 'this body of death,' his flesh as now constituted (Rom 7:7-25) but, within his soul, man's will is itself divided: loves are disordered, compulsion governs desire, volition and affect diverge, morally paralyzing the child of Adam. Constructing this image of fallen man with great theological precision in the *Ad Simplicianum*,[75] Augustine repeats the image as self-portrait in its autobiographical companion piece, the *Confessions*. Despite its ostensibly 'happy' resolution, the conversion rendered with such passion in Book VIII, the *Confessions* is a terrifying book, an unflinching acknowledgment of how little one can understand even of one's own experience, because of the 'wounded will ... this monstrousness ... the mysterious punishment that has come upon all

men, the deep, hidden damage in the sons of Adam' (*Conf.* VIII.9,21). Disoriented, divided, man has an infinite capacity to deceive not only others, but also and especially himself. As Augustine catalogues his self-deceptions and mistakes, his seeking for God in places where he could not possibly find him, causing suffering to others and to himself, he acknowledges that they have been revealed as such only within the 'eschatological' perspective of the conversion. Only now does he see the doomed randomness of his earlier efforts, only now the pattern, known then solely to God, that would ultimately bring him to the saving moment in the garden.

Deceiving and self-deceived, Augustine had been opaque both to others and to himself. Thinking that he understood and even constructed his own circumstances, he later realized that they, too, had been opaque: he had not really understood, while living it, his own history.[76] And God himself had been opaque, unavailable where Augustine had most fervently sought him, unobtrusively present when Augustine most despaired. The only clear moment of revelation comes in the garden, when 'a light of serenity infused my heart, and all the darkness of doubt vanished away' (VIII.12,29). The book's literary style poignantly underscores this divine opacity: though the *Confessions* is a fervent dialogue with God, Augustine has the only speaking part. God remains silent throughout, his 'responses' to Augustine's inexhaustible prayers, questions, observations and importunings mediated only through scripture, or recognized retrospectively in a personal history whose pattern could be perceived only once the 'ending'—the conversion—was known.

So too with public history. Augustine's brief seduction by the 'mirage of his generation,' the triumphalism of the Theodosian reforms with their coercive anti-pagan legislation, gave way to a thorough-going historical agnosticism from which, again, he never wandered.[77] Scripture alone, he asserts, records the unambiguous acts of God in history; and the period corresponding to the record of those actions had, by his own day, long passed. The present, Augustine argues, might be punctuated by infinite miracles, but it remains nonetheless inscrutable: God's immediate intentions cannot be divined with any security, no matter how strenuous the effort to match prophecies to contemporary events. Here public history is even more opaque than personal history, because the Christian does know how the story will end—with the second coming of Christ, the resurrection of the dead, the transforma-

tion of the body, and the establishment of God's kingdom.[78] But history's timeframe is known only to God; and if the hour of the End is unknowable in principle, it cannot serve to impose a plot on time—none, rather, that those living in time can discern.[79]

Given this radical agnosticism, history cannot serve as the prime medium of salvation. Augustine emphasizes, rather, the individual as the locus and focus of God's saving grace,[80] and so plays stunningly creative variations on the great themes of Christian millenarianism—communal corporeal redemption, the Kingdom of God, and the millennial sabbath rest of the saints. The fleshly body will be raised spiritual, he insists with Paul (I Cor 15:44-54); but 'spiritual' refers to the body's moral orientation, not its substance.[81] The risen body will have corporeal substance. It will even have gender—women, too, shall as women be raised.[82] But this raised corporeal body will not dwell on a transformed earth. In nonchalant defiance of the scientific thinking of his day, Augustine insists that these corporeal bodies will dwell in the heavens: the Kingdom of God will not come on earth.[83] Apocalyptic traditions of agricultural fecundity and social harmony thus drop out of Augustine's picture: no food, sex, or social relations in the Kingdom. His saved individuals, in their perfected bodies—spiritually oriented, physically flawless, thirty-something—stand in comradely contemplation of the beatific vision of God.[84] In a final reinterpretation of a classically millenarian theme, Augustine wrenches all temporal reference away from that amalgam of the seventh world-age and the thousand-year reign in Apocalypse 20, the Sabbath rest of the saints. The six preceding world ages, Augustine asserts, are indeed historical; but the Great Sabbath, the eschatological seventh day, is the saints themselves. 'After this present age God will rest, as it were, on the seventh day; and he will cause us, *who are the seventh day*, to find our rest in him' (*De civ. Dei* XXII.30,5).

How successful was this Tyconian-Augustinian tradition? And how do we gauge 'success'?

In terms of establishing orthodoxy's hermeneutical approach to Apocalypse, this tradition, as we have noted, succeeded famously. Tyconius and Augustine virtually defined the content of all later Catholic commentaries.[85] And, of course, in terms of empirical verification, the essence of their argument has been vindicated by the simple passage of time, which has continued not to end.

Contemporaries, however, were less convinced. Events combined

with long tradition to undermine the persuasiveness of a non-apocalyptic understanding of current history. Thanks to the Vandal invasions of the Western empire in the mid-fifth century, where Christian chronographical calculation had long fixed 500 CE as the year 6000 since Creation and thus the expected date of the Parousia, the world very nearly did 'end' on time. The Donatist chronicler of the *Liber Genealogus* knew exactly, in 452 CE, how things stood: he had divined that the name of the Vandal king of Carthage, Genseric, revealed the number of the Beast, 666.[86] His contemporary, Augustine's own student, Quodvultdeus, in his analysis of salvation history, the *Liber de promissionibus*, argued strenuously that the apocalyptic signs of the approaching End-time were currently—again, thanks to these barbarians—being fulfilled. John's Apocalypse and the prophecies in Daniel both pointed to the Holy City's humiliation by the forces of Antichrist, in particular 'ab haereticis et maxime Arrianis qui tunc plurimum poterunt' (IV.13,22; these tribes, of course, were Arian). The Getas and the Massagetas, furthermore, two other tribes, were none other than the long-foretold forces of Gog and Magog.[87]

Even after the year 500/6000 slips past, allusions to active millenarian expectation, popular and clerical, glimmer in our problematic sources. 'False christs' appear and gather followings; Western chronographers nervously recast the global time-table as the recalculated year 6000 draws near; *rustici* importune more learned clerics for the age of the world, the better to know when it will end; famine, earthquakes, and assorted terrestrial and celestial disturbances continue to send people into panic.[88] Such movements continue throughout the Middle Ages and on into the modern period.[89] And in our own day, with the approaching end of both the century and the millennium, we see once again that the combination of current events, biblical apocalypses, and millennial numbers continues to exert its ancient appeal.[90]

Western culture, in brief, continues to move within the charged field that lies between the twin poles of the Christian message, the 'now/not yet' of a messiah who has come and a messianic age yet to arrive. Though few moderns, Christian or otherwise, know the ancient traditions of the world ages and the chronographical count-downs to the millenial Sabbath Rest of the saints, the year 2000 nevertheless serves as a focus of apocalyptic speculation. Christianity's texts and its doctrine permit—indeed, encourage—the pursuit of the millennium as a perpetual possibility; and thus John's vision of the End will continue to

support and inspire those who hope to live to see the coming of God's Kingdom.

NOTES

[1] Research for this essay was supported by a summer grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities. Bernard McGinn and Richard Emmerson originally proposed the topic as my contribution to their forthcoming volume *Apocalypse in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca 1991): I thank my editors for permitting me to develop and present my more detailed study here. Elizabeth A. R. Brown, Richard Landes, and Robert Markus criticized earlier versions, for which I thank them. Finally, I thank Charles Kannengiesser for inviting me to present these ideas to a plenary session of the 1989 North American Patristics Association.

[2] Paul consistently preached the imminent Parousia, from his earliest extant epistle (1 Thes 1:10; 4:13-17; 5:23) to his last (e.g., Rom 13:11). Of the canonical gospels, Mark is the most unambiguously apocalyptic; the later evangelists adjust tradition in light of the lengthening period between the resurrection and the Parousia. Expectation of the imminent arrival of the Kingdom (as distinct from the Parousia) most likely goes back to the teaching of Jesus of Nazareth, the retrospective starting-point of Christian tradition; he held this belief in common with many of his Jewish contemporaries. See E. P. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism* (Philadelphia 1985), for a compelling reconstruction of both Jesus and his social and religious environment; on the ways that apocalyptic expectation and disappointment affected traditions from and about him, my own study, *From Jesus to Christ. The Origins of the New Testament Images of Jesus* (New Haven 1988). On the apocalypticism of the Pauline communities, Wayne Meeks, *The First Urban Christians* (New Haven 1983), esp. ch. 8; of the early movement generally, John Gager, *Kingdom and Community* (Englewood Cliffs 1975). A reliable guide to the huge secondary literature on this topic is W. G. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament* (Nashville 1975).

[3] Some definitions: I use *eschatology* to mean those beliefs concerned with the end of time and final destiny of humankind: they imply no necessary time-table. *Apocalypticism* holds that the End, however conceived, is imminent. *Millenarianism* holds that the redemption brought by the End, whenever it comes, will be collective, historical, and earthly (as opposed to heavenly or exclusively spiritual): the earth will sprout fruit in abundance; both human and animal society will be transformed and at peace. The idea of a thousand-year period implicit in the term is less essential to its import than is its focus on the earth and human history as the ultimate arena of redemption. *Apocalyptic millenarianism*, finally, holds that such redemption is imminent. For a more detailed discussion of these distinctions, see R. Landes, 'Lest the millennium be fulfilled: Apocalyptic expectations and the pattern of western chronography, 100-800 CE,' *The Use and Abuse of Eschatology in the Middle Ages*, ed. W. Verbeke, D. Verhelst and A. Welkenhuysen (Leuven 1988) 205-208.

[4] The phrase is Yves Christe's, 'Traditions littéraires et iconographiques dans l'interprétation des images apocalyptiques,' *L'Apocalypse de Jean: Traditions Exégétiques et Iconographiques IIIe-XIIIe siècles* (Geneva 1979) 111.

[5] This is academic consensus, though the dating is uncertain. See discussion in Kümmel, *Introduction* 466-69.

[6] The concept of a 'New' Testament as something completing and superseding the 'Old' was a while in coming. As late as the mid-second century, as orthodox a figure as Justin Martyr could refer to the gospels as the apostles' 'memoires' (*Dialogue with Trypho* 105): 'Scripture' for him, as for most early Christians, was the Greek translation of the Jewish Bible, the Septuagint. Christians considered oral traditions as authoritative as written ones, and Papias even preferred 'the living voice' to mere books (Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 3.39,12).

[7] For example, the restitution of the twelve tribes of Israel (e.g., Isa. 11:11); the confluence of all peoples at the renewed temple in a renewed Jerusalem (Isa 2:2-4); peace guiding not only human but also animal society (Isa 65:25); the earth bringing forth fruits in abundance (Baruch 29:5). For a discussion of these themes and their transfer to early Christian redemptive mythology, see Fredriksen, *Jesus*, 81-86, 98-102, 165-75; Sanders, *Jesus*, ch. 1-8 passim and 335-40; also J. Jeremias, *Jesus' Promise to the Nations* (Nashville 1958).

[8] *Adv. haer.* 5.33,4; cf. Eusebius' disapproving review, *HE* 3.39,12; for Irenaeus' own millenarianism, the last five chapters of Book 5, deleted from most Western MSS once the church had condemned such opinions. According to Eusebius, one Cerinthus, an early second-century Christian, taught likewise that 'after the resurrection there would be an earthly kingdom of Christ, and men again inhabiting Jerusalem.' Bad enough; but worse was Cerinthus' alleged belief that, in this kingdom, 'there would be a space of a thousand years for celebrating nuptial festivals' (*HE* 3.28,2). The orthodox Lactantius, almost two centuries later, opined similarly (*Div. inst.* 7, 24). On Cerinthus, see *infra* n. 23.

[9] Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 5.33,3. This same passage, here ascribed to Jesus, occurs almost verbatim in the Jewish *Apocalypse of Baruch* 29:5 (c. 70-100 CE).

[10] *Dialogue with Trypho* 81, referring specifically to Isa 65 and Apoc 20:4-5.

[11] The link between the suffering of the righteous and impending redemption comes directly from Jewish tradition (e.g., Dan 7:21; 12:2-13; 2 Mac 6:12-7:38), and carried over into the synoptic apocalypses (Mk 13:1-37 and parr.). See discussion in W. H. C. Frend, *Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church* (Grand Rapids 1981; orig. pub. 1965), esp. 31-103. During the reign of Severus, a Christian chronographer named Judas calculated, on the basis of Daniel's 70 weeks (Dan 9:24), the imminent appearance of Antichrist, 'so mightly did the agitation of persecution, then prevailing, shake the minds of many,' Eusebius, *HE* 6.7. Faith in the world's imminent destruction strengthened the resolve of Pionius, martyred in Smyrna in the mid-third century, *Martyrdom of Pionius* 4 (*Acts of the Christian Martyrs*, ed. H. Musurillo (Oxford 1972), 141-42); see the reconstruction of the events behind this text in R. Lane Fox, *Pagans and Christians* (New York 1986) 460-92.

[12] Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 5.26,1; 30,3; Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* 3.13,10, though the Roman state also hinders the coming of Antichrist (the κατέχων of 2 Thes 2:7; *De resurr. mort.* 24; *Apol.* 32). Victorinus of Pettau, before 303 CE, awaited the 'ruina Babylonis, id est civitatis Romanae,' *In Apoc.* 8,2; 9,4.

[13] See esp. the discussions in J. Daniélou, 'La typologie millenariste de la semaine dans le christianisme primitif,' *Vigiliae Christianae* 2 (1948) 1-16; A. Luneau, *L'histoire du salut chez les pères de l'Eglise. La doctrine des âges du monde* (Paris 1964); G. Ladner, *The Idea of Reform* (New York 1967) 222-32; Landes, "Apocalyptic expectations," 141-56; B. McGinn, 'Endtime and Eternity: Biblical Apocalyptic in Western History,' (unpub. MS; pp. 1-18 and nn. 1-42); and the dossier of texts assembled by A. Wilkenhauser, 'Die

Herkunft der Idee des tausendjährigen Reiches in der Johannes-Apokalypse,' *Römische Quartalschrift* 45 (1937) 1-24, discussed by Hans Bietenhard, 'The millennial hope in the early church,' *Scottish Journal of Theology* 6 (1953) 12-30; also *La Cité de Dieu, BA* vol. 37, 768 n. 26 on millenarianism. The classic monograph is L. Gry, *Le millénarisme* (Paris 1904), esp. chs. 3-5.

[14] 'The first Parousia of our Lord took place on a Wednesday ... 5,500 years after Adam.... One must, therefore get to 6,000 years before the Sabbath, the type and figure of the future kingdom of the saints who will reign with Christ after his descent from the heavens, as John tells in the Book of Revelation.... From the birth of Christ one must count another 500 years, and only then will the End come,' Hippolytus, *In Danielem* 4.23-24; cf. Julius Africanus, *Chronographia* (fragments), *ANF* 6, 130-138. For the pastoral and exegetical context of this argument, David D. Dunbar, "The Delay of the Parousia in Hippolytus," *Vig. Chr.* 37 (1983) 313-27. On Christianity's conflation of chronology and eschatology, Momigliano's rich essay, 'Pagan and Christian historiography in the Fourth Century A.D.,' *The Conflict between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century*, ed. idem (Oxford 1963) 79-99, esp. 83f. On ancient Christian chronography more generally, V. Grumel, *La Chronologie* (Paris 1958); and Landes, 'Apocalyptic expectations.'

[15] On Montanism, T. D. Barnes, *Tertullian* (Oxford 1971); Lane Fox, *Pagans* 375-418; J. Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition*, vol. 1: *The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition* (Chicago 1971) 97-108; specifically in N. Africa, Paul Monceaux, *Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique Chrétienne*, vol. 1 (Paris 1901) 399 ff. Hippolytus tells of two Catholic bishops: One, in Syria, persuaded by his reading of scripture that the End was at hand, led his people (including women and children) out into the desert to meet Christ. They were almost arrested as bandits. Another, in Pontus, became convinced by his own visions. His congregants devoted themselves to prayer and repentance to the neglect of their fields, and as a result fell into confusion, and the community into financial ruin (*In Dan.* 4.18-19). Hippolytus' commentary was probably directed against the millenarian calculations of the obscure Judas: above, n. 11. On chronography as an anti-apocalyptic strategy, Landes, 'Apocalyptic expectations'; also Lane Fox, *Pagans* 267.

[16] In the imagined architecture of the ancient cosmos, the earth stood at the center of the seven planetary spheres, at the furthest remove—spatially and ontologically—from the regions of increasing stability and harmony that stretched from the moon upward toward the planets and the realm of the fixed stars. Such a worldview is prejudiced in favor of the 'upperworldly' and spiritual; the redemption of the physical and earthly is, accordingly, incoherent. On the religious significance of this model of the universe, E. R. Dodds, *Pagan and Christian in an Age of Anxiety* (New York 1965) 5-36, 43; Hans Jonas, *Gnosticism* (Boston 1963) 3-47; more generally, as evinced in Justin, Clement and Origen, H. Chadwick, *Early Christian Thought and the Classical Tradition* (Oxford 1966); for an early fourth-century pagan statement of this cosmology and its religious implications, Sallustius, Περὶ Θεῶν καὶ κοσμοῦ, ed. A. D. Nock (Cambridge 1926).

[17] None of Marcion's own writings survives; the classical heresiologists universally condemn him. See esp. Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* 3.24,2-4, ridiculing Marcion specifically through appeal to Apoc 20: he reports that recently (late second century) witnesses in Judea had seen the Heavenly Jerusalem suspended above them for forty days. See also, against docetists and gnostics generally, idem, *De resurr. mort.* (ch. 19 and 25 on Apoc); also his *De praescriptione haereticorum* 7, warning against the consequences of excessive philosophizing.

[18] *De resurr. mort.* 19. He goes on heatedly to defend the resurrection of the flesh by an appeal to Apoc 20:2-14, *ibid.*, 25. The position he protests is similar to that taken by Tyconius and Augustine on the first resurrection: see *infra*, p. 161.

[19] Those who think otherwise 'reject the labor of thinking and seek after the outward and literal meaning of the law, or rather, give way to their own desires.... They go on to say that even after the resurrection there will be engagements to marry and the procreation of children, for they picture to themselves the earthly Jerusalem about to be rebuilt with precious stones...,' *De principiis* 2.11,2-3; cf. his earlier exegesis of 1 Cor 15 against those 'of our own people who either from poverty of intellect or lack of instruction introduce an exceedingly low and mean idea of the resurrection of the body,' 2.10,3.

[20] *De princ.* 2.11,2, with reference to Isaiah 54, 61, 65, Ezek 28, and Mt 26. The passage begins with a refutation of the vision of the New Jerusalem in Apoc 21:10-12.

[21] Nepos had died beforehand, but his opinions, circulated through his book, continued to gain popular support. Dionysius carried the day: see Eusebius, *HE* 7.14, 1-3; Lane Fox, *Pagans* 265.

[22] On Dionysius' criticism of Apoc, *HE* 7.24,6-8. Eusebius clearly shared his lack of enthusiasm for the book and endorsed Dionysius' conclusions, though cf. 3.18 and 24. In the East the differences in the Greek style of the gospel as opposed to that of the Apocalypse were evident: Cyril of Jerusalem, Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret, and the Council of Laodicea did not receive Apoc into the canon, nor did it appear originally in the Peshitta or the Armenian NT. In the West, however, the Latin translations suppressed perception of linguistic differences between these texts. For discussion, see the indexed references in B. Metzger, *The Canon of the New Testament* (Oxford 1987).

[23] Gaius, debating against a Montanist, had rejected both the Fourth Gospel (favored by Montanists because of its emphasis on the Paraclete) and Apocalypse (*HE* 3.28); fragments in Syriac of Hippolytus' defense of Apoc against Gaius survive, ed. and trans. J. Gwynn, *Hermathena* 6 (1888) 397-418. For Gaius, *DTC* 2, cols. 1309-11 (under 'Caius'). The Alogi, a late second-century group in Asia Minor, apparently rejected both texts for the same reason, but their position is described by hostile heresiologists (Epiphanius, *Haer.* 51; see *DCT* vol. 1, col 898-901).

Whoever Cerinthus was and whatever views he held, his name ultimately became a code word for 'millenarian heresy' in the patristic lexicon of bad names. It was not always so. Irenaeus, himself millenarian, had grouped Cerinthus rather with the Christian dualists Marcion and Valentinus: if doctrines can have antitheses, gnosticizing dualism with its radical spiritualizing would be the opposite of millenarianism. Relating Polycarp's story that John the Apostle fled the public baths upon learning that Cerinthus was within, Irenaeus presented the author of one of the gnostics' favorite gospels (i.e., John) as implicitly condemning Cerinthus for gnosticism (*Adv. haer.* 5.3,4). By the time Eusebius retold the story, Cerinthus had become a millenarian, so that John the putative author of Apoc condemns Cerinthus for his carnal interpretation of a thousand-year reign of the saints on earth, *HE* 3.28.

[24] 'Nul pays n'a conservé avec plus de soin les archives de sa geste du sang,' A.-G. Hamman, *La vie quotidienne en Afrique du Nord au temps de S. Augustin* (Paris 1979) 318. The texts of these two *acta*, the court 'transcript' of the Scilitan martyrs, executed in Carthage in 180 CE, and the prison diary of Perpetua, may be found, with facing English translation, in Musurillo, *Acts* 86-89, 106-31 ('Passio Sanctarum Perpetuae et Felicitatis' 1-2 and 14-21 are editorial extensions of the diary). On the effects of the persecutions on

N. African tradition, R. A. Markus, *Saeculum. History and Society in the Theology of St. Augustine* (Cambridge 1970) 106-109; Monceaux, *Histoire littéraire* 1. 28-96.

[25] On the cult of the dead, particularly the feasting and drinking associated with it, F. van der Meer, *Augustine the Bishop* (New York 1961) 471-526; Brown, *Augustine of Hippo* 207, 299; also, idem, *The Cult of the Saints* (Chicago 1981) for the Western church generally; Frend, *The Donatist Church*, 114, 174; ibid, p. 99, for this burial practice, apparently by pagans too. Also, idem, 'The North African cult of the martyrs,' *Jenseitsvorstellung in Antike und Christentum: Gedenkschrift für Alfred Stuiber. Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 9 (1982) 154-67. G. Bonner comments on the 'stern, enthusiastic element' in Latin, and esp. N. African Christianity, 'to which the visions of the Apoc made an immense appeal,' 'S. Bede and the tradition of Western apocalypse commentary,' *Jarrow Lectures* 1966, 3; on the 'ivy' controversy—the result of introducing Jerome's new translation of Jonah at mass—Augustine, Epp. 71.3,5; 75.6,21 and 7,22; on a congregant's similarly violent rejection of liturgical innovation, *Retr.* 2.11; discussed in van der Meer, *Augustine* 341.

[26] See esp. Markus, *Saeculum, loc. cit.*, on the characteristic features of this community 'born during the age of the persecutions'; idem, 'Christianity and Dissent in Roman North Africa: Changing Perspectives in Recent Work,' *Studies in Church History* 9, ed. Derek Baker (Cambridge 1972) 21-34, on the ways in which this construction of the Christian community's identity—Donatism's in particular and North African Christianity's in general—'was the local expression of a permanent religious option,' 21. The slogan derives from Cyprian, *De unitate catholicae ecclesiae* 5-6.

[27] Given the Empire's collapsing economic and political fortunes (not to mention frontiers) in the second half of the third century, Diocletian's concern with the health of the *pax deorum* was reasonable and, by his lights, well-placed. Before turning on more 'orthodox' Christian communities, he legislated against Manichees as well, to bring them to religious conformity; see his instructions to Julianus, proconsul of N. Africa, collected in *Fontes Iuris Romani Anteiustiniani*, 2nd ed. (Florence 1940-43) 2:544-89. See Brown's essay, 'The diffusion of Manichaeism in the Roman Empire,' *Religion and Society* 95ff., on Diocletian; a brief review of his other policies in T. D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius* (Cambridge 1981) 3-14; also Lane Fox, *Pagans* 592-95; on the 'great persecution,' Frend, *Martyrdom* 477-535.

[28] The authority of Cyprian stood behind rebaptism as a way to reintegrate the lapsed (e.g., Epp. 69-75); and the experience of the African church in the wake of the Decian persecution rehearsed, in many ways, events after Diocletian. See Hans Lietzmann, *History of the Early Church* (London 1961) 2:250-57; Frend, *Donatist Church* 125-40; Monceaux, *Histoire littéraire*, vol. 2; J.-P. Brisson, *Autonomisme et Christianisme dans l'Afrique Romaine* (Paris 1958) 33-121. On Catholicism's betrayal of African, Cyprianic Christianity, Markus, *Saeculum* 106-15.

[29] On the origins of the schism, Brown, *Augustine of Hippo* 213ff.; Frend, *Donatist Church* 1-24; Monceaux, *Histoire littéraire* vols. 3 and 4; Lietzmann, *History* 3:82-93. Constantine's conversion thus resulted in no necessary change of world-view for the disenfranchised Donatists. As Markus notes, 'It was a "Cyprianic Church" that entered the "great persecution" of Diocletian in 303, and the same Cyprianic Church that emerged when it ended, in 305.... Donatism was, quite simply, the continuation of the old African tradition in the post-Constantinian world. It was the world that had changed, not African Christianity,' 'Christianity and Dissent,' 29; also Frend, 'Cult,' 160f.

[30] On the 'dense pattern' of North African bishoprics, Lane Fox, *Pagans* 272; Serge Lancel, *Actes de la conférence de Carthage en 411* (Paris 1972) 1:192ff. 'By 395, over three hundred bishops on each side faced each other in little towns,' Brown, *Augustine* 203; ibid., 226, on the Donatist majority in Numidia. Frend, *Donatist Church*, analyzes the geographical distribution of allegiances in terms of local (i.e. African) vs. Roman culture; see below, n. 31 Donatists went to Augustine to settle disputes in the early years of his episcopacy (Ep. 33,5), and on occasion would attend Catholic services and public debates (Possidius, *Vita* 4; 7). On cohabitation between Catholics and Donatists, Ep. 35,2.

[31] On violence, Brown, *Augustine* 227-43: on the mysterious Circumcelliones, whose violent acts increase with the government's moves against Donatism, ibid., 229; Brisson, *Autonomisme* 325-57; Emin Tengström, *Donatisten und Katholiken. Soziale, wirtschaftliche und politische Aspekte einer nordafrikanischen Kirchenspaltung* (Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia XVIII, 1964) 24-83. Anti-Donatist legislation after 393 specifically targeted the familial and social relations that this *modus vivendi* expressed and facilitated (patterns of intermarriage and inheritance; Catholic tolerance for Donatists, and so on), Brown, ibid., 227. Finally, in the intimate towns of Late Antiquity, these communities lived virtually on top of each other, visiting the same graves, praying cheek by jowl (e.g., Ep. 29.10-11: congregants in Augustine's church could hear the Donatists worshiping in theirs).

[32] Persuasively argued by Peter Brown, 'Christianity and Local Culture in Late Roman Africa,' *Religion and Society in the Age of St. Augustine* (New York 1972) 279-300, orig. pub. *Journal of Roman Studies* 58 (1968) 85-95; an interpretation developed by Markus, 'Christianity and Dissent'; idem., *Saeculum* 105-32. Augustine's Donatist counterpart, the bishop Parmenian, was himself Italian, not African (see the entry in *Prosopographie Chrétienne du Bas-Empire*, vol. 1, ed. A. Mandouze (Paris 1982)).

[33] On Julius Africanus, *infra* 153; Lactantius, *Div. Inst.*, looks forward to the post-millennial procreation of 'an infinite multitude' by the saints, mountains oozing honey, wine flowing down in streams, and rivers running with milk (7.24). 'Perhaps someone may ask now when those things we mentioned are going to take place.... The entire expectation or length of time left seems no greater than two hundred years' (7.25, cf. 14). Lactantius writes Book 7 c. 313. Hilarianus' *De cursu temporum*, a workmanlike calculus of the world's age derived from the generations given in scripture, concludes with a review of the final things as revealed in Apoc, *Chronica Minora*, vol. 1, ed. Carl Frick (Leipzig 1892) 155-74. His reassertion of this traditional time-table may in fact have been a delaying tactic: were some in his community insisting that the End would come sooner? See Landes' remarks, 'Apocalyptic expectations...,' 152. Efforts to view Hilarianus as Donatist rather than Catholic seem to me a somewhat desperate disavowal of Catholicism's own normative millenarianism (*Prosopographie...*, 558): Martin of Tours believed that Antichrist had already been born and was approaching maturity (Sulpicius Severus, *Dialogues* I, 14 (CSEL 1, 197)); crowds in Constantinople were thrown into a pre-millenniel panic in 398 after witnessing signs and prodigies (Augustine, *De excidio urbis* 6,7, mentions the incident without such an interpretation; the later historian Philostorgius attributes the panic to fear of the impending apocalypse, *Church History* 11.6-7. See additional ancient literature on this episode in Landes, 'Apocalyptic expectations,' 155 n. 70a). The fact that the elusive Commodian can arguably be placed anywhere between the third and fifth centuries obliquely makes the same point: millenarianism was

normative. On Commodian, esp. P. Courcelle, *Histoire littéraire des grandes invasions germaniques* (Paris 1964) 319-37; Brisson, *Autonomisme* 378-410; cf. H. Grégoire, *Les persecutions dans l'empire romain* (Brussels 1950) 114-17. The fall of Rome in 410 only added to the level of nervous anticipation; more on that, *supra*. See finally Jean Hubaux, 'Saint Augustin et la crise eschatologique de la fin du IVe siècle,' *Académie royale de Belgique. Bulletin de la classe des lettres et des sciences morales et politiques* xl (1954) 658-73.

[34] Markus, *Saeculum* 55. Donatists preserved the continuity of persecution with millenarian hope. Catholics, on the contrary, could see Constantine's and the Empire's conversion as pointing to the realization of biblical prophecies about God's righteous kingdom. Hesychius, bishop of Salona, argues this apocalyptic interpretation of current events c. 418 (Augustine, Epp. 197-99; see G. Coulée's discussion in *La Cité de Dieu XIX-XXII, BA* 37 (Paris 1960) 763-65; also J.-P. Bouhot, 'Hesychius de Salone et Augustin,' *S. Augustin et la Bible* (Paris 1986) 229-50; also Markus' comments, *Saeculum* 39. *Mutatis mutandis*, Eusebius argued similarly: Constantine's conversion realized Isaiah's millenarian prophecies. Eusebius is a non-apocalyptic millenarian thinker, e.g., his argument in *Laus* 16.6-7. Augustine and his colleagues felt similarly in 399, when Imperial fiat led to the destruction of pagan property—in more prophetic perspective, the overthrow of idols 'secundum propheticam veritatem,' *Enarr. in Ps.* 62,1; 149,7; cf. *Sermo* 24,6; *De cons. Ev.* I.14,21: 34,52; discussion in A. Mandouze, 'Saint Augustin et la religion romaine,' *RA* 1 (1958) 187-223; Markus, *Saeculum* 22-44, esp. 30ff.; on Hesychius in particular, 39; Brown, 'St. Augustine's attitude toward religious coercion,' *Religion and Society* 265-74, and his reprise of this discussion, *Aug.*, 231f.

Jaroslav Pelikan's observation on Christians of the second century seems to me equally true for those of the third, fourth, and fifth: 'The impression seems unavoidable that the relation between "already" and "not yet" in Christian apocalyptic raised more problems for philosophical theologians ... than it did for believers and worshipers,' *Christian Tradition* 1:126.

[35] See esp. van der Meer's wonderful evocation of these festivals, *Augustine* 471-557, esp. 498ff.; Peter Brown, *Cult of the Saints*, who places the cult within its larger context of Latin Christendom, extending up to the period in Gaul of the Franks; idem, *Augustine* 206, 217-20, 229; Frend, *Donatist Church*, 172-75, who notes the prominent role of Circumcelliones (*circum cellas*) in such observances; Brisson, *Autonomisme*, 293ff. on martyrs.

[36] 'In the great churches [where the *mensa* stood] the pious offering of wine gradually degenerated into a carousal which no-one could definitely forbid because it took place under the pretext of pious observance and in obedience to an ancient tradition, and was therefore in a certain sense protected.... As to the pleasures of the table, it is sufficient to note that a certain church ... was actually called the *basilica tricliarum*,' van der Meer, *Augustine* 514f. Ambrose kept a tight rein on such observances: the sacristan in Milan prevented Monica from taking a meal at the oratory, *Conf.* 6.2.

[37] Ep. 29,11. On forced conversions after 399, Serm. 10,4; 47,17; Brown, *Augustine* 230f., 234. The dead were another generation, and family celebrations were themselves more decorous than the community-wide *laetitiae*: van der Meer, *Augustine* 498ff.; Brown, *Cult* 23.

[38] 'At [the saints'] graves, the eternity of paradise and the first touch of the resurrection come into the present,' Brown, *Cult* 78. Whatever the inheritance from older pagan

custom, these Christian feasts over the martyr's body did not substitute for, displace, or sublimate envisaged millenarian society, but actively anticipated it through re-enactment. Augustine complains about the feasts and about millenarianism in exactly the same terms: they focus over-much, he says, on food and on 'carnal' pleasures (by which he means 'physical' as well as corrupt in a moral sense, Epp. 22; 29,11; *De mor. man.* I.34,75; cf. *De civ. Dei* 20.7,1). Inveighing against both, he boldly identifies the saints' feasts, the miracles worked by their relics, and their one-thousand-year reign in the first resurrection, but argues that this should be understood as present and non-eschatological: see above, p. 163.

The violent enthusiasm of the Circumcelliones might best be understood in light of this anticipatory apocalypticism, and thus the interminable argument about their essential orientation—political? religious?—put to one side: millenarian groups typically seek to flatten distinctions of social status within their communities (hence the frequent use of sibling language, 'brother' and 'sister'), and such flattening can at the same time be intended as a critique of current society and perceived by those outside as a threat to it. See Gager's discussion, *Kingdom and Community* 32-27. On the 'class background' of the Circumcelliones, Frend, *Martyrdom* 556 and *Donatist Church,* passim; cf. Tengström's critique, *Donatisten*, and Markus' review of the discussion, 'Christianity and Dissent.'

[39] These are *De bello intestino* (c. 370?), on the universality of the church; a subsequent defense of his position, *Expositiones diversarum causarum* (c. 375?); the sole surviving work, the *Liber regularum* (c. 382), on scriptural exegesis; and finally, perhaps c. 385, the now-lost *Commentary on Apocalypse* (on which see below, n. 40). On Tyconius himself, Gennadius, *De viris inlustribus* 18, PL 58.1071; Monceaux, *Histoire littéraire* 5: 165-219; *Prosopographie...*, 1122-27.

[40] On his transformation of his own tradition, Markus, *Saeculum* 56, 115-26, and my own discussion, 'Tyconius and the End of the World,' *REAug* 28 (1982) 59-71; on his influence on Augustine, esp. the latter's views on grace, and thus on Paul and conversion, A. Pincherle, *La formazione teologica di Sant'Agostino* (Rome 1947) specifically on Augustine's reading of Tyconius during the crucial decade of the 390s, idem, more recently, 'Sulla formazione della dottrina agostiniana della grazia,' *Rivista di storia e letteratura religiosa* XI.1 (1975) 1-23: U. Duchrow, *Christenheit und Weltverantwortung* (Stuttgart 1970) 216-33, with special reference to the early interpretation of Paul; W. S. Babcock, 'Augustine's interpretation of Romans,' *Augustinian Studies* 10 (1979) 54-74; idem, 'Augustine and Tyconius. A study in the Latin appropriation of St. Paul,' *Studia Patristica* XVIII, pt. 3 (1982) 1210f.; E. TeSelle, *Augustine the Theologian* (London 1970) 180-82; most recently, my own essay, 'Beyond the body/soul dichotomy. Augustine on Paul against the Manichees and the Pelagians,' *RA* 23 (1988) 87-114, esp. 99-101. I will address the issue of Tyconius' influence on Augustine's ideas on history and the cult of the saints as these appear in *De civitate Dei* above. Martine Dulaey has recently offered a minimalist interpretation of this influence ('L'Apocalypse. Augustin et Tyconius.' *Saint Augustin et la Bible*, ed. A.-M. LaBonnardière (Paris 1986) 367-86), but she neglects to consider the Pauline material and concentrates solely on Apoc.

[41] On Tyconius' success in influencing subsequent generations of commentators, see e.g., Yves Christe, 'Apocalypse et *traditio legis,' Römische Quartalschrift* 71 (1976) 47f., 54; idem, 'Traditions littéraires,' 111; Bonner, 'St. Bede,' 5 and passim; B. McGinn, *Visions of the End: Apocalyptic Traditions in the Middle Ages* (New York 1979) 27, 40, 77. See also the following note.

[42] Jerome evidently used Tyconius for his own de-millenarianizing re-edition of Victorinus of Pettau's Apocalypse commentary (see Haussleiter's edition, CSEL 49); also influenced were the Apocalypse commentaries of Apringius (ed. M. Ferotin, Paris, 1900); Beatus (ed. H. A. Sanders, Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome, vol. VII, 1930); Bede (PL 93.129-206); Caesarius of Arles (ed. G. Morin, Maredsous, vol. 2 (1942) 209-77); Primasius (PL 68.793-936); and finally the Turin fragments (ed. F. LoBue, Texts and Studies, N.S. vol. 7, Cambridge 1963). Gerald Bonner has attempted to reconstruct Tyconius' text by collating passages from these later commentaries, 'St. Bede,' 21-29; idem, 'Toward a text of Tyconius,' *Stud. Pat.* 10 (*TU* 107) (1970) 9-13. More recently, L. Mezey has tentatively identified a fragment of a Budapest MS as Tyconian, 'Un fragment d'un codex de la premiere epoque carolingienne (Ticonius *in Apocalypsin*?)', *Miscellanea Codicologica F. Masai dicata*, vol. 1 (Gand 1979) 41-50; cf. A. Pincherle's response to Mezey's original Hungarian article (pub. 1976), 'Alla ricerca di Ticonio,' *Studi Storico-Religiosi* 2 (1978) 355-65. See also the substantial textual note in Ladner, *Reform* 260 n. 93. These studies have now been superseded by Kenneth Steinhauser, *The Apocalypse Commentary of Tyconius: A history of its reception and influence* (Frankfurt 1987).

[43] Gennadius says Tyconius 'nihil in ea [i.e., the Commentary] carnale sed totum intelligens spirituale,' *De vir. inlus.* 18; Tyconius, in his preface to the *Liber*, calls his exegetical principles 'mysticae', and argues specifically that the time of the End can neither be calculated nor deduced. His own disclaimer notwithstanding, modern scholars have nonetheless held both that Tyconius was the source of the later Catholic anti-millenarian Apocalypse commentaries and that he himself expected the End in his own lifetime. This fundamentally incoherent interpretation seems to have begun with F. C. Burkitt's efforts to fix a *terminus ad quem* for the composition of the *Liber*: he focused on Tyconius' invocation of the period 350 years in Apoc 11 (*Liber* V, 60-61) to conclude that Tyconius was himself making millenarian calculations, *The Book of Rules of Tyconius*, Texts and Studies III, pt. 1 (Cambridge 1894) xviii. A near-century of authoritative scholarship then repeated his misreading: T. Hahn, *Tyconius-Studien* (Leipzig 1900): Tyconius refers all millenarian prophecies to the future (p. 7), yet 'letzteres Ereignis erwartet T. als nahe bevorstehend,' (p. 6); W. Kamlah, *Apokalypse und Geschichtstheologie* (Berlin 1935): Tyconius' 'Auslegung hat überall die konkreten Bilder der Ap zu verfluchtigen gesucht' (p. 10); nonetheless, he 'berechnet die Zeit von Christus bis zum Ende auf 350 Jahre, er erwartet das Kommen des Herrn als nahe' (p. 71); E. Dinkler's excellent article in *Pauly-Wissowa Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenshaft* (1936) VI A, 1, col. 853: states that 'T. von der historisch-realistischen Exegese zur geistlichen überging, und mit dem starren Chiliasmus brach,' though, referring to Burkitt, Dinkler adds that 'im Anschluss an Ap 11:2, die Geschichte der Kirche auf 350 Jahre nach Christi Kreuzigung errechnet und ihr Ende und der Einsatz der letzten grossen Verfolgung als kurz bevorstehend notiert wird.' Bonner follows Kamlah, 'St. Bede,' 5 and n. 21. Dulaey most recently has reiterated this misreading of Tyconius' use of the 350-year period, 'Tyconius et Augustin,' 374 (again citing Burkitt and Rule V); cf. my arguments against this particular misconstrual, 'Tyconius,' *REAug* 28 (1982) 60-83, and against this misinterpretation generally, passim; so also Markus, *Saeculum* 58.

[44] Burkitt's is still the critical edition (full reference in preceding note); this has recently been translated by W. S. Babcock, *The Book of Rules of Tyconius*. Society of Biblical Literature (Atlanta 1989). On the immediate relation of the *Liber* to Tyconius' lost com-

mentary, the current work of Charles Kannengiesser, *A Conflict of Christian Hermeneutics in Roman Africa: Tyconius vs. Augustine* (Berkeley Center for Hermeneutical Studies, forthcoming 1990). Kannengiesser speculates that the seven seals of Apocalypse 5-10 inspired Tyconius' formulation of seven exegetical rules in the *Liber*: 'It looks as if Tyconius had attempted to transfer the celestial symbolism of the sealed scroll ... into the rhetorical culture of Roman Africa.... Out of the archaic form of apocalypticism proper to the Johannine Revelation, the heavenly "seals" become ... *regula* submitted to rational inquiry,' MS p. 17. His student, Pamela Bright, suggests more strongly that the *Liber* should not be considered 'a general introduction to exegesis but specifically as an introduction to the exegesis [of] the Apocalypse,' *The Book of Rules of Tyconius. Its Purpose and Inner Logic* (Notre Dame 1988) 185.

[45] 'Necessarium duxi ante omnia quae mihi videntur libellum regularem scribere, et secretorum legis veluti claues et luminaria fabricare, sunt enim quaedam regulae mysticae quae universae legis recessus obtinent et veritatis thesauros aliquibus invisibiles faciunt,' Prol. 1.1-5. As Kannengiesser notes, the 'rules,' as Tyconius sees them, are *in* scripture already: he intends not to produce them, but to write an essay on them, *op. cit.* MS p. 7; cf. Augustine's misreading of Tyconius, *De doctrina christiana* 3.30,42.

[46] Mt 26:64; cf. LR I.4,13-5,10, on the distinction between the continuous coming of Christ's glorious body, the Church, and Christ's own Parousia at the End.

[47] 2 Thes 2:7; Ezek 39:1-4; cf. Apoc 20:7f; LR VII.74, 16-75,6.

[48] LR VI.67,7-28. Apparently in his Apocalypse commentary Tyconius correlated anti-Donatist persecution with John's prophecy: Bede criticized him for it ('... et martyria vocans, has [these persecutions] in eadem gloriatur Apocalypsi fuisse praedictas,' PL 93, 133a). Augustine levels a similar critique against Gaudentius (*c. Gaud.* 1.27,30-31). Similarities between Apoc 6:9-11 and present circumstances probably struck most thinking Donatists as obvious, and for obvious reason: see my earlier discussion, 'Tyconius,' 65f.,69,72. If Tyconius did construe the persecutions in light of John's Apocalypse, he would have interpreted them no more 'apocalyptically' than he did John's own text.

If persecution does not indicate the nearness of the End, according to Tyconius, then neither does the cessation of persecution: his invocation of the 'peace of the church' 350 years after the Passion (which occurred, according to N. African Christian chronology, in A.D. 29) refers not to an expectation that the Parousia would occur in 379 but, more likely, to the accession of Flavian, himself a Donatist, as senior Imperial officer in Africa following a period of severe anti-Donatist legislation. Cf. LR V.60-61; Frend, *Donatist Church* 199f.; Brown, *Augustine* 226; Fredriksen Landes, 'Tyconius,' 73 and n. 69.

[49] Such an ecclesiology, as Augustine was quick to point out, shatters the theological foundations of Donatist separatism, *De doct. chr.* 3.30, 42ff.; *C. ep. Parm.* I.1,1; Markus *Saeculum* 111-26; BA 28, p. 718 n. 10; Dinkler, 'Ticonius,' col. 855.

[50] On his technique, Burkitt, *Rules* xv.

[51] In other words, 10, 100 (10×10), and 1000 ($10\times10\times10$) all have the same 'value', and can stand for perfection. See LR V.59,20ff; also 60-61, for his exegetical feat of establishing an essential synonymity between '42', '350', and '1260.'

[52] LR V.56,10-20 on the 1000 years of the first resurrection; for the church as the 'spiritual body'—'nubes corpus est spiritale post baptisma et claritas filii hominis; primus est enim adventus Domini iugiter corpore suo venientis'—VI.43,1-5, a complex de-eschatologizing of one of Paul's most apocalyptic and eschatological concepts, I Cor 15:23-53. Tyconius' argument here is very similar to that of Gaius in the second century,

on account of which Gaius was denounced by Hippolytus as a heretic (see above, n. 21; discussion in Bietenhard, 'Millennial Hope,' 18). The difference is that Tyconius, while so spiritualizing these classically millenarian passages, nonetheless also insists on fleshly resurrection and an historical Kingdom of God. He apparently developed this idea in his Apocalypse commentary as well. So Gennadius: 'in qua expositione ... mille ... annorum regni in terra iustorum post resurrectionem futuri suspicionem tulit; neque duas in carne resurrectiones futuras inter iustos et inter iniustos, sed unam et simul omnium.... Distinctionem sane duarum resurrectionum ita facit: *Primam, quam iustorum Apocalypsis dicit, credimus modo in ecclesiae incremento agi, ubi iustificati per fidem a morticinis peccatorum suorum per baptismum ad vitae aeternae stipendium suscitantur, secundam vero generaliter omnis hominum carnis,' De vir. inlus.* 18 (PL 58.1071-72).

[53] Thus, in a striking conflation, Tyconius understands Isaac to have received 'the spirit of the adoption as sons, crying "Abba", Father' (Rom 8:15), LR III.25,10-13. This insistence on the unity of scripture is a strong defense against the criticisms of the Manichees, who repudiated the Old Testament while revering the New.

[54] This confluence of salvation history and interiority, which Tyconius in Rule III works out with special attention to the letters of Paul, marks as well Augustine's early Pauline commentaries, written in 394. The chronology is difficult—we have no sure proof that Augustine had read Tyconius until he mentions him in Ep. 41, written in 396—and Augustine's own intellectual independence, which so transforms his sources, often obscures their precise influence (a problem esp. for reconstructing his reading in the Neoplatonists during his period in Milan, on which esp. P. Courcelle, *Recherches sur les Confessions* (Paris 1968) 157-67. The methodological problem here is similar). See my earlier arguments, 'Augustine's Early Interpretation of Paul,' (Ph.d. diss., Princeton University 1979. Ann Arbor 791.9772) 209-15; more recently, 'Body/Soul,' 99-101. Pincherle, *Formazione* 175ff., is the standard study; see too his comments. 'Da Ticonio a Sant'Agostino,' *Rich. Rel.* 1 (1925) 464 (his appeal to Ambrosiaster I find unnecessary). Also Monceaux, *Histoire littéraire* 5.218-19; TeSelle, *Augustine* 180-82; Babcock, 'Augustine's Interpretation,' 67-74, and 'Augustine and Tyconius,' 1210f. Dulaey's search for unambiguous influence—which, for someone like Augustine, who so dominates his sources, I fear we can rarely detect—in part compels her minimalism, 'Tyconius and Augustine.'

[55] Fredriksen Landes, 'Tyconius,' 72-73; Markus, *Saeculum* 115-25; Christe, 'Traditions littéraires...', 110. This theme of the eschatological (as opposed to quotidian) holiness of the church underlies Tyconius' appeal to the 'two cities,' Jerusalem and Babylon, the city of God and the city of the devil. For Augustine's variations on this theme in *De civitate Dei*, see the comments in *BA* 37, 774-77 n. 28.

[56] *De civ. Dei* 20.7,1; see esp. G. Folliet, 'La typologie du *sabbat* chez Saint Augustin. Son interpretation millénariste entre 386 et 400,' *REAug* 2 (1956) 371-90.

[57] *De civ. Dei* 20.7,1; on the tradition from Baruch, *supra* p. 152 and nn. 7 and 9; Lactantius, *Div. Inst.* 7; on the laetitiae, *supra* p. 156 and nn. 35-37.

[58] In 388, writing against the Manichees, Augustine had already complained about those Christians who '... worship tombs and who drink with utmost self-indulgence over the dead and set food before them. In so doing, they bury themselves at such graves, and then attribute their gluttony and drunkenness to religion,' *De moribus manichaeorum* I.34,75; in Ep. 22, to Aurelius of Carthage, he urged a total reform and suppression of such practices. See van der Meer, *Augustine* 520-25 on the suppression of a feast day at Hippo; also the literature cited *supra* nn. 35-37.

[59] An alternative Christian chronology that had named 400 CE as the year 6000 since Creation 'coincided closely with a series of independent eschatological traditions in which computists variously added some 350, 365, or 400 years to Christ's birth or death in order to discover the end of the interim period between the First Coming and the Parousia. In the period between 350 *Annus Incarnationis* and 400 *Annus Passionis*, then, a series of target dates for the Parousia fell due, coming most densely in the final years of the 4th century,' Landes, 'Apocalyptic expectations,' 155 and nn. 68-70a, for abundant citations of primary documents. B. Kötting lists a series of signs and prodigies occurring between the years 389 and 420 throughout the Empire (Rome, Jerusalem, Constantinople, Africa), "Endzeitprognosen zwischen Lactantius und Augustinus," *Historisches Jahrbuch* 77 (1958) 125-139, esp. 137f. For Augustine's own discussion of such phenomena and calculations, his correspondence with Hesychius, Epp. 197-99; *De civ. Dei* XX-XXII passim; cf. his earlier discussion of the pagan prophecy that the church would end 365 years after the Crucifixion, XVIII.53,2; his sermon *De excidio urbis*, on the fall of Rome in 410 (CCSL 46, 249-62; critical edition and translation by M. V. O'Reilly, *Patristic Studies* 89 (Washington D.C. 1955)); *Ennar. in Ps.* 89. See also, finally, Hubaux, 'La crise eschatologique,' (full reference *supra* n. 33); also, idem, 'Saint Augustin et la crise cyclique,' *Augustinus Magister*, vol. 2 (Paris 1954) 943-50.

[60] Serm. 113,8.

[61] Hesychius' first letter to Augustine, written in 418, is lost; Epp. 197, 198 (Hesychius' answer to Augustine's first response), and 199 (Augustine's final rebuttal of H.'s position) records their remaining correspondence. For the argument drawing on the two evangelical passages cited above, Ep. 198,5 and 6. The correspondence has been reviewed most recently by Bouhot, 'Hesychius,' (full reference n. 34 *supra*).

[62] Ep. 198,15 (disappointment); 34-39 (the eschatological worthlessness of arguments from current events). Augustine had apparently suggested to Orosius, his younger colleague, that he compose a world history to make the point that things had been worse (and so, by implication, that bad things do not the End of the World make). Orosius misconceived the project and, sliding into a by-then traditional Christian progressivism, argued that, since the empire had become Christian, things had never been better. See esp. Th. Mommsen, 'Orosius and Augustine,' *Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, ed. Eugene F. Rice, Jr. (Ithaca 1959) 325-48; H.-I. Marrou, 'Saint Augustin, Orose et l'augustinisme historique,' *La storiografia altomedievale* I (Spoleto 1970) 59-87; F. Fabbrini, *Paolo Orosio, uno storico* (Rome 1979) 369-433; H.-W. Goetz, *Die Geschichtstheologie des Orosius* (Darmstadt 1980).

[63] 'There are thus two rebirths...: one according to faith, which comes here and now through baptism; and the other in the body, a rebirth which will come in its freedom from decay and death, as a result of the great and last judgment. Similarly, there are two resurrections: the first, the resurrection of the soul, which is here and now...; and the second, which is not now, but is to come at the end of the world,' *De civ. Dei* XX.6,2. Cf. Apoc 20:5-5, the actual source of this idea of two resurrections, though Augustine does not allude to it here; for Tyconius' interpretation, *supra* n. 50.

[64] In the traditional reading of Apoc, this 1000-year period begins in the *seventh* age, after the Parousia of a sovereign Jesus. Augustine, by placing this in the sixth age, before the year 6000, moves it back into 'normal' history, before the Second Coming.

[65] Here he depends on Tyconius: see *supra* p. 159 and n. 51.

[66] On these Tyconian themes, see *BA* 28, p. 720 n. 10; on the appearance in Augustine of the theme of the city of God, F. C. Cranz, 'The development of Augustine's ideas on

society before the Donatist controversy,' *Augustine*, ed. R. A. Markus (New York 1972) 336-403, at 391 n. 59; cf. Dulaey, 'Tyconius et Augustin,' 382.

[67] XXII.8, where Augustine reviews the many miracles known personally to him, which occurred locally, through prayer to saints and contact with their relics. They concern the restoration of bodily integrity—they are healing miracles—and thus, he says, 'testify to that one supreme miracle of salvation, the miracle of Christ's ascension *into heaven in the flesh in which he rose from the dead*' just as the redeemed will rise when the final Kingdom is established (8,1). Cf. esp. the miracles worked by Stephen's relics, 8,11-20 and 22. On the perils of viewing such piety as 'vulgar' and 'ignorant,' Brown, *Cult* 12-22.

[68] This seven-age division was a traditional Christian scheme. Augustine, in his allegorizing commentary on Genesis against the Manichees (written in 388) correlated these with stages in human development (*infantia, pueritia, adolescentia, iuventus, senior aetas/gravitas*, and *senectus*), *De gen. c. man.* I.23,35-24,42; this comparison is repeated, slightly later, in *De 83 div. qu., qu.* 58,2, though in 393 Augustine can use it strictly temporally, discussing the sweep of history toward the reign of the saints, Serm. 259,2; cf. the final passage of *De civ. Dei* XXII, cited above p. 166. For discussion of this theme, and its importance to Augustine's theology, see esp. the fundamental article by Cranz, 'Augustine's ideas on society'; Folliet, 'La typologie du Sabbat'; Luneau, *Histoire du Salut* 285-356; Ladner, *Reform* 232-36; McGinn, 'Endtime and Eternity,' unpub. MS, 18-22.

[69] *De vera rel.* 26,49; see discussion in Cranz, 'Augustine's ideas on society,' 350f.

[70] E.g., death in Adam, Rom 5:12f.; the promise of redemption to Abraham, 4:1-24; salvation in Christ, proleptically in baptism 5:6-11, 6:5-14; final redemption with Christ's second coming, 8:12-38, 11:25-36, etc. To call this a 'pattern' is to exaggerate Paul's organization. On his argument in Romans, and the ways it contrasts specifically with Augustine's exegesis of it, my essay, 'Paul and Augustine. Conversion narratives, orthodox traditions, and the retrospective self,' *JTS* 37.1 (1986) 3-34, esp. 27ff.

[71] *Exp. Ep. ad Rom.* 13-18 and passim, written in 394; E. T.: P. F. Landes, *Augustine on Romans*. Society of Biblical Literature (Chico 1982). The outlines of a four-fold scheme of history appear a few years earlier, in qu. 61,7, when Augustine is considering Mt 14:16; he develops it fully with Romans. See Cranz, 'Augustine's ideas on society,' 355; Luneau, *Histoire du Salut* 357-83; Fredriksen, 'Body/Soul,' 89-92.

[72] Their striking similarity on this point, expressed through an exegetical concentration on Paul, is one reason I incline toward seeing Tyconian influence in 394, the year in which Augustine produced these commentaries on Romans.

[73] These are: the two commentaries on Romans, *Exp. Ep. Rom.* and the *Inchoata expositio; Exp. Ep. Gal.*; qu. 66-68 of *De 83 div. qu.*; and finally, capping this period, the *Ad Simpl.* and the *Confessions*.

[74] *Ad Simpl.* I.ii,16, a reference to Rom 11:13. I analyze his exegesis and soteriological argument in 'Paul and Augustine,' 23-28 and 'Body/Soul,' 92-105. His formulation depends upon the development of his idea, when working on these texts, of the *massa damnata*.

[75] On the psychology of delight and the ways that love escapes conscious control as proof that the will is not free, *Ad Simpl.* I.2,13-22; Brown, *Augustine* 154-57; Fredriksen, 'Body/Soul,' 97, 103f., 110-12; R. A. Markus, 'Augustine. Human Action: Will and Virtue,' *The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Medieval Philosophy*, ed. A. H. Armstrong (Cambridge 1970) 380-94.

[76] 'I was blown about by every wind, and You steered my course too hiddenly,' *Conf.* IV.14,23; on his difficult departure from Carthage to Rome, 'Why I left one country and went to the other, You knew, O God, but You did not tell either me or my mother,' V.8,15; on leaving Rome for Milan to assume the municipal professorship of rhetoric, 'I applied for the post with support from men far gone in the follies of the Manichees—the purpose of my journey being to be quit of them, though neither they nor I realized it,' V.13,23; on his efforts to grasp the Platonic arguments on the nature of evil, 'You caressed my head, though I knew it not,' VII.14,20.

[77] See references to Brown, Markus, and Mandouze *supra* n. 34.

[78] See his affirmation of the order of final events, *De civ. Dei* XX.30.

[79] See esp. Markus, ***Saeculum*** 154-86, on the secularization of history, the Empire, and in a certain sense, the church concomitant with such a view.

[80] True already in 392 when Fortunatus, in the course of their debate, criticized Augustine's views on evil and redemption as androcentric and hence insufficient, *c. Fort.* 21 and 22. Cf. Augustine's comment on Romans 8:8-24: the 'creatura' who groaned for redemption was man himself (*Exp. Prop. Rom.* 53,4). On his creation of the introspective self as his premier theological category, the warrant for which he sees esp. in Paul, Fredriksen, 'Paul and Augustine,' 25-28; see also U. Duchrow, 'Der sogennante psychologische Zeitbegriff Augustins im Verhältnis zur physikalischen und geschichtlichen Zeit,' *ZThK* 3 (1963) 267-88.

[81] On the eschatological spiritual body, e.g., *De gen. ad litt.* XII. 7,18; cf. 35,68; *De civ. Dei* XXII.21, where he insists on the corporeality of this spiritual body. North African Christians especially had long been insistent on this point (viz., e.g., Tertullian's *De resurr. mort.*); and this fact may account for the interruption of the debate between Fortunatus and Augustine in 392. Their audience (a mixed group of Catholics and Donatists) protested Fortunatus' 'unreasonableness', says the recording scribe, because 'rationibus potius agi volebant: quia videbant eum non omnia quae in Apostoli codice scripta sunt velle accipere' (*c. Fort.* 19). This popular command of scripture seems most unlikely, especially in light of the fact that Augustine, just prior to this outburst, had explained his reticence to cite Paul's letters in the debate because of the confusion they might elicit in his audience ('ad eas [scripturas] ego descendo, ac nihil praetermittendum esse postulo ne quibusdam capitibus utentes nebulas afferamus eis quibus notae scripturae non sunt'). The crowd reacted vociferously, I think, to the particular Pauline verse that Fortunatus adduced: 'caro et sanguis regnum Dei non possidebunt, neque corruptio incorruptelam possidebit.' On the contrast of Paul's meaning in 1 Cor 15:50 to later Christian readings committed to a doctrine of physical resurrection, my essay, 'Vile Bodies: Paul and Augustine on the resurrection of the Flesh,' *Biblical Interpretation in Historical Perspective*, ed. M. Burrows and P. Rorem (Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, forthcoming 1991).

[82] There had obviously been some debate on the issue, *De civ. Dei* XXII.17. Augustine asserts emphatically, however, that gendered resurrected bodies will not be sexually active; cf. Lactantius, *Div. Inst.* 7.24.

[83] He enjoys defying contemporary science and scientific philosophy, *De civ. Dei* XXII.4-5; 11 (against arguments concerning the weight of the elements); cf. his earlier critique of philosophy's view of the human body, XIII.16-19; on this point, A. Trapè, 'Escatologia e antiplatonismo di Sant'Agostino,' *Augustinianum* 18 (1978) 237-44. For discussion of the theological and philosophical significance of Augustine's views on the body and resurrection, Margaret R. Miles, *Augustine on the Body* (Missoula 1979), esp.

99-125. Medical science fared no better when Augustine had a theological point in view: on this, Elizabeth A. Clark, 'Vitiated seeds and holy vessels; Augustine's Manichaean Past,' *Ascetic Piety and Women's Faith. Essays in Late Ancient Christianity* (Queenston: Mellen Press, 1986), 291-349; Peter Brown, 'Sexuality and Society in the Fifth Century A.D.: Augustine and Julian of Eclanum,' *Scritti in onore di Arnaldo Momigliano* (Como 1983), 49-70.

[84] *De civ. Dei* XXII.15, the determination of age based on Christ's at the time of his resurrection; also 19 (people fat in this life will not be fat in the Kingdom) and 20 (amputees will have their limbs restored).

[85] See *supra* nn. 41 and 42.

[86] *Liber genealogus, Chronica Minora* MGH IX, 194 for the year 452 A.D. This text is a pastiche of earlier apocalyptic chronographies, notably those of Augustine's contemporary, Hilarianus [see *supra* n. 33] and the Latin translation of Hippolytus' chronology, as well as Victorinus of Pettau's commentary on Apocalypse. Both chronographies had named 500 A.D. as the end of the sixth age of the world. On this text, Monceaux, *Histoire littéraire* 6:249-53; also Landes, 'Apocalyptic expectations,' 162.

[87] 'Gog et Magog, ut quidam dixerunt Gotos et Mauros, Getas et Massagetas, per quorum saevitiam ipse iam diabolus ecclesiam vastat et tunc amplius persequetur, cessare etiam faciens *iuge sacrificium* [Dan 11:13]; propter quod ammonet dominus dicens: *venio cito, beatus qui vigilat et servat vestimenta sua ne nudus ambulet* [Apoc 16:15],' *loc. cit.* He *almost* got Augustine right: 'Gentes quippe istae quas appellat Gog et Magog *non sic sunt accipiendae* tamquam sint aliqui in aliqua parte terrarum barbari constituti, sive quos quidam suspicantur Getas et Massagetas propter litteras horum nominum primas...' *De civ. Dei* XX.11. See discussion, with respect to Tyconius, in Fredriksen Landes, 'Tyconius,' 67f.; Landes, on the Vandals' stimulation of such interpretations, 'Apocalyptic expectations,' 156-65.

[88] On the false Christ of Bourges, Gregory of Tours, *Hist. Franc.* X.25; on recalculating the year 6000 (a concern of, *inter alia*, Isidore of Seville, Julian of Toledo, Fredegar, Bede, Ademar of Chabannes, and the Carolingian computists), Landes, 'Apocalyptic expectations,' 161-203, with copious references to primary sources: see esp. his graph on 210-11. On the rustici who demand 'quot de ultimo miliario saeculi restent anni,' Bede's letter defending his decision to alter traditional computus, *Ep. ad Pleguinem* 14 (in C. W. Jones, *Bedae opera de temporibus* (Cambridge 1943) 313); on the effect of prodigies and signs, e.g., the apocalyptic panic in the year 968 induced in the army of Otto I by an eclipse, MGH SS. V: 12; for a similar response to an earthquake in the year 1000, MGH SS. IX: 202.

[89] Henri Desroche, *Dieux d'Hommes. Dictionnaire des Messianismes et Millénarismes de l'Ère Chrétienne* (Paris 1969) is a convenient florilegium; since 1969 the list could be added to. The classic monograph on the late Middle Ages and early modern period is Norman Cohn, *The Pursuit of the Millennium* (New York 1961). On the modern period, J. F. C. Harrison, *The Second Coming. Popular Millenarianism 1780-1850* (London 1979); for a popular apocalyptic decoding of current events, Hal Lindsey, *Late Great Planet Earth* (Grand Rapids 1970), now in its one hundred and fourth printing. Marxism is a modern secular vision of millenarian bliss; and in this sense, 1848 would be represent for International Labor what 500 A.D. represented for Latin traditions of the year 6000.

[90] To cite one recent striking example: 'Everything is falling into place. It can't be too long now. Ezekiel says that fire and brimstone will be rained upon the enemies of God's

people. That must mean that they'll be destroyed by nuclear weapons. They exist now, and they never did in the past.

Ezekiel tells us that Gog, the nation that will lead all the other powers of darkness against Israel, will come out of the North. Biblical scholars have been saying for generations that Gog must be Russia. What other powerful nation is to the north of Israel? But it didn't seem to make sense before the Russian revolution, when Russia was a Christian country. Now it does, now that Russia has become communistic and atheistic, now that Russia has set itself against God. Now it fits the description of Gog perfectly.' So former president Ronald Reagan, quoted in Martin Gardner, 'Giving God a Hand,' *New York Review of Books*, August 13, 1987, from Grace Haskell, *Prophecy and Politics, Militant Evangelists on the Road to Nuclear War* (Laurence Hill 1986).

Department of Religion, Boston University
Boston, MA 02215 U.S.A.

Vigiliae Christianae 45 (1991), 184-208, E. J. Brill, Leiden

REVIEWS

Marco Rizzi, *La questione dell' unità dell' »Ad Diognetum«* (Studia Patristica Mediolanensia 16). Milano, Vita e Pensiero. Pubblicazioni della Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, 1989. 202 S. L. 24.000.

In dieser Studie von Rizzi wird nochmals, jetzt von einer neuen Optik aus, das vielerörterte Problem der Authentizität von *Ad Diognetum* 11-12 behandelt. Bekanntlich befand sich in der einzigen uns bekannten Handschrift (dem 1870 verbrannten *Codex Argentoratensis* F) eine Lücke direkt vor *Ad Diogn.* 11. Diese hat dazu beigetragen, dass seit der *editio princeps* von Estienne (1592) Zweifel an der Echtheit der Schlusskapitel aufkam und dass im Laufe der Zeit viele sich bemüht haben, inhaltliche und stilistische Unterschiede zwischen diesen und den vorhergehenden Abschnitten aufzuspüren.

Daneben versuchte man, in *Ad Diognetum* 11-12 Zusammenhänge mit und Parallelen zu anderen Autoren und Traditionen aufzuweisen (so z.B. noch in der Edition von Meecham aus dem Jahre 1949). Nach den Studien jedoch von Dom P. Andriessen (1946-1950) und den zwei Ausgaben des Diognetbriefes von H.I. Marrou (1952, 1965²) machten sich stärkere unitarische Tendenzen bemerkbar, weil man in den beiden letzten Abschnitten eine Entwicklung von Gedanken aus dem vorhergehenden Teil und einen logischen Zusammenhang erkannte.

Ein absoluter *consensus* in der Beurteilung der Frage der Einheit der Schrift blieb jedoch aus, auch nachdem man »externe« Kriterien (wie die paulinische Rezeption oder die Theorie der literarischen Gattungen) anwandte. Rizzi hat einen anderen Weg zu gehen versucht, indem er von einer autonomen Analyse der Eigenart der Abschnitte 11 und 12 ausgeht, ohne sich zunächst um den Zusammenhang mit dem Vorhergehenden zu kümmern. Dass er das mit grosser Sorgfalt in der Beweisführung getan hat, ist ebenfalls ein Verdienst. Anfangend mit der Analyse der Kerngedanken aus Abschnitt 11 (der Theologie des Λόγος - υἱός, der Soteriologie), kommt er allmählich zu der Schlussfolgerung, dass starke theologische, strukturelle und stilistische Verbindungen mit der übrigen Schrift unverkennbar sind. Dieses Ergebnis mag an sich wenig Aufsehen erregen, wichtig ist, dass es mit einer neuen Methode erreicht wurde.

Bei seiner Erforschung der literarischen Gattung des Diognetbriefes

hebt der Verfasser weiter den protreptischen Charakter dieser Schrift und die Beziehungen zum Werk des Clemens von Alexandrien hervor. So schliesst er sich auch der gängigen Auffassung an, *Ad Diognetum* sei in Alexandrien geschrieben worden. In diesem Zusammenhang könnte, neben einer von Rizzi erwähnte Clemensstelle (*Strom.* V 72, 2-3), der Hinweis auf eine Parallele von *Ad Diogn.* 12, 1 zu einer Origenesstelle interessant sein. Es handelt sich um eine Allegorie der Bäume der Erkenntnis und des Lebens, welche im Paradies (allegorisiert als die Seelen der Heiligen) wachsen. Origenes bemerkt (*Lev. hom.* XVI 4, 16-23, Sources Chrét. 287, S. 278; in der Übersetzung Rufins): non tibi videtur quod Pater caelestis agricola huiusmodi arbores in anima tua excolat et huiusmodi plantaria in tua mente constituat?

Zusammenfassend können wir feststellen, dass diese Erstlingsarbeit des jungen Forschers Rizzi als eine anregende Studie von grosser Ursprünglichkeit gelten darf.

6523 LH *Nijmegen*, Postweg 152 G.J.M. Bartelink

Samuel Rubenson, *The Letters of St.Antony. Origenist Theology, Monastic Tradition and the Making of a Saint* (Bibliotheca Historico-Ecclesiastica Lundensis 24). Lund University Press, Lund 1990. 224 S.

Die 7 Briefe des Einsiedlers Antonius wurden bisher zu wenig beachtet. Dazu kam, dass die Echtheitsfrage dieser ursprünglich koptisch geschrieben Briefe noch nicht eindeutig beantwortet worden ist. Von der ursprünglichen koptischen Fassung sind nur zwei Folioblätter mit dem 4. Brief, dem Ende des 3. Briefes und dem Anfang des 5. Briefes erhalten. Bereits Hieronymus kannte 7 Briefe des Antonius, und zwar in einer griechischen Übersetzung des koptischen Originals. Wir besitzen jetzt dem Antonius zugeschriebene Briefe in verschiedenen Übersetzungen (auf Georgisch, Lateinisch, Arabisch; einen Brief auf Syrisch).

Die Authentizität der 7 Briefe (es gibt übrigens auch umfangreichere Sammlungen), wofür man sich insbesondere auf externe Zeugnisse beruft, wird heutzutage offenbar mehr und mehr angenommen. Für das Bild des Wüstenvaters hat das seine Konsequenzen. Eine gewisse Verschiebung war allerdings schon früher aufgetreten, als man zur Kenntnis gelangte, dass das ihm beigelegte Prädikat »ungebildet« (γράμματα μὴ μαθών und ἰδιώτης in der *Vita*) nicht bedeute, Antonius sei Analphabet, sondern er sei in der griechischen Kultur nicht bewandert.

Die Benutzung des Gedankengutes der Briefe um dem historischen Antonius näher zu kommen (sowie Dörries es mit den schwer auf ihre Echtheit hin zu prüfenden Antonius-Apophthegmen getan hat; und sowie Heussi in der Antonius-*Vita* die typischen Athanasiana von den anderen Bestandteilen zu trennen versucht hat) hat jedoch weitgehende Konsequenzen. Es hat sich nämlich herausgestellt, dass die Briefe einen mehr oder weniger origenistischen Einschlag haben, was eine gewisse Bekanntschaft der alexandrinischen Theologie bei Antonius voraussetzt: »The obvious dependence on popular Platonic philosophy and Alexandrian theological tradition reveals that the author was no 'ignorant monk' who had simply exchanged the garb of the peasant for the monastic habit, but a teacher who wore a monk's garment as if it was the robe of a philosopher« (S. 11).

Rubenson hat Studien über Bildung und kulturellen Austausch im Ägypten des 3./4. Jhts. ausgewertet um zu beweisen, dass der Origenismus nicht auf einige wenige Intellektuelle beschränkt, sondern weit verbreitet war. Er versäumte nicht zu erwähnen, dass in einigen frühen Zeugnissen (vor 450) Antonius mit der origenistischen Tradition von Nitria in Verbindung gesetzt wird. So schliesst er nicht aus, dass Antonius ein Vorgänger der späteren Origenisten in der Mönchwelt, wie Evagrius, gewesen ist. Bisweilen argumentiert Rubenson schwach, z.B. wenn er den Bericht, Antonius habe als Knabe keine Schule besucht, als einen Topos abtut oder wenn er, trotz der Zeugnisse der *Vita*, Kenntnisse des Griechischen bei Antonius voraussetzt.

Die Authentizität der Briefe ist bei alledem eine Kernfrage. Wenn man sich darüber einig geworden ist, wird uns nichts anderes übrig bleiben als die Änderungen im Bild des Antonius, wie Rubenson sie mit vieler Überzeugungskraft geschildert hat, als definitiv zu betrachten.

6523 LH *Nijmegen*, Postweg 152 G. J. M. Bartelink

Robert Godding, *Bibliografia di Gregorio Magno (1890/1989)*) Coll. Opere di Gregorio Magno. Complementi 1). Città Nuova Editrice, Roma 1990. X, 350 S.

Die vorliegende Bibliographie, welche die Publikationen über Gregor den Grossen in den letzten hundert Jahren umfassen will, ist anlässlich der 14. Jahrhundertfeier der Papstwahl Gregors (590) zusammengestellt

worden und enthält über 2600 Titel. Sie ist nach fünf Hauptthemen geordnet: Bibliographie und Miszellen — Gregor und seine Zeit — Die Werke — Das Gedankengut —, Schicksal (Fortleben, Hagiographie, Ikonographie). Zahlreiche Querverweise und ein Autoren- und Stichwortverzeichnis machen das Benützen der Bibliographie dieses hervorragenden Papstes besonders bequem. Gregor hat sich als Theologe, Exeget, Seelenhirt und kräftiger Verwalter bewährt und seine Wirkung war bis tief ins Mittelalter spürbar. Aus Goddings klargegliederten Bibliographie geht hervor, wie die verschiedenen Aspekte seines Wirkens viele Studien hervorgerufen haben.

6523 LH *Nijmegen*, Postweg 152 G. J. M. Bartelink

Jean Chrysostome, *Discours sur Babylas*. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes par Margaret A. Schatkin, avec la collaboration de Cécile Blanc et Bernard Grillet; suivi de *Homélie sur Babylas*. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes par Bernard Grillet et Jean-Noël Guinot (Sources Chrétiennes 362). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1990. 330 p. 245 F.

Babylas, évêque d'Antioche, y subit le martyre vers 205. En 378 ou 379 Jean Chrysostome redigea le *Discours* qui est la pièce de résistance du présent ouvrage. Mais ce discours, comme le dit d'ailleurs le titre grec («en l'honneur du bienheureux Babylas et contre les Grecs»), est bien plus que l'éloge de l'évêque et du martyr; il contient en outre une apologie de la religion chrétienne sous la forme d'une polémique contre Julien et les païens. En lisant cet ouvrage on se rend compte à quel point le souvenir du règne de Julien, avec ses tentatives de faire renaître le paganisme, était encore vivant. Sa critique se dirige particulièrement contre les écrits des philosophes Porphyre et Hiéroclès, et du sophiste Libanius, dont il cite des parties d'une lamentation en honneur d'Apollon, composée à l'occasion de l'incendie de son temple à Daphné (22 octobre 362). Il est le seul témoin de ces textes.

Dans une excellente introduction Miss Schatkin fournit les informations requises concernant l'auteur, l'œuvre et le texte. Cette partie de l'ouvrage est une adaptation française de l'édition de Miss Schatkin publiée en 1968: *Critical Edition of, and Introduction to St.John Chrysostom's «De Sancto Babyla, contra Iulianum et Gentiles»*, Ann

Arbor (Michigan), 1968. L'introduction, cette fois accompagnée d'une traduction anglaise, fut reprise dans la collection *The Fathers of the Church* en 1985. Les éditeurs des *Sources Chrétiennes* ont eu l'heureuse idée de publier en appendice l'*Homélie sur Babylas* du même Jean Chrysostome. Voilà donc le résultat d'une collaboration internationale.

Le lecteur dispose donc maintenant d'une édition critique de deux textes importants, touchant le culte des martyrs à Antioche et les rapports de l'Église avec l'hellénisme à l'époque de l'empereur Julien. Les traductions françaises reflètent bien la langue éloquente de l'auteur grec.

2312 GD *Leiden*, Haarlemmerstraat 106B J. C. M. VAN WINDEN

Jean Chrysostome, *Trois catéchèses baptismales.* Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes par Auguste Piédagnel, avec la collaboration de Louis Doutreleau, s.j. (Sources Chrétiennes 366). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf 1990. 288 p. 200 F.

Le Père Piédagnel, éditeur des *Catéchèses mystiques* de Cyrille de Jérusalem (S.C. 126) et des *Panégyriques de Saint Paul* (S.C. 300), présente ici les trois dernières catéchèses de Jean Crysostome pas encore publiées dans cette série. En 1957 le Père A. Wenger publia *Huit catéchèses baptismales* du même auteur (S.C. 50, 3me éd. 1985). Dans son Introduction Piédagnel s'étend sur la tradition assez complexe des catéchèses chrysostomiennes.

Les trois catéchèses, éditées ici, sont des instructions pré-baptismales, données par Chrysostome, quand il était prêtre à Antioche, probablement en 388. L'éditeur défend la thèse, que la troisième catéchèse de la série éditée par Wenger ne fait pas partie de cette série, mais appartient plutôt à celle publiée ici et devrait être la quatrième dans la présente édition. C'est l'homélie prononcée le matin de Pâques devant les nouveau-baptisés.

Les catéchèses publiées ici sont très intéressantes par l'explication du sens du baptême que Chrysostome donne et par sa description des cérémonies baptismales telles qu'on les accomplissait à Antioche à ce temps. L'éditeur éclaircit les textes dans son Introduction et dans les notes.

Le texte grec contient un nombre de petites erreurs: Lire I 5,3 ἀφεῖσα; I 12,4 point d'interrogation après παλιγγενεσίας; I 17,10 Ὅ; II 2,1 τί; II 3,29 οἱ; II 4,18 et 21 ὃ; III 2,23 Ὅσοι; III 2,51 ᾗ; III 9,24 ἀπὸ. Omission

de l'esprit en II 4,6; 5,1 et note 23, p. 187. En II 7,22-23 on fait une coupure erronée: προ-σώζεσαν au lieu de προσ-ώζεσαν.

La traduction est en général exacte éclaire. En I 2 on a omis une phrase (23-24): "Les initiés savent la force de cette coupe, vous le saurez aussi bientôt".

Les Sources Chrétiennes ont été enrichies d'une édition précieuse.

2312 GD *Leiden*, Haarlemmerstraat 106B J.C.M. VAN WINDEN

Grégoire de Nysse, *Lettres*. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes par Pierre Maraval (Sources Chrétiennes 363). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1990. 346 p. 224 F.

Voici une nouvelle édition des lettres de Grégoire de Nysse par un auteur qui a bien mérité de Grégoire, non seulement par l'édition de la *Vie de sainte Macrine* mais aussi par ses études sur les lettres 1, 2 et 3 de cette collection.

Dans une introduction bien fournie l'éditeur esquisse la vie et la personne de Grégoire comme elles se revèlent dans ces lettres. Quant à sa personnalité Grégoire y apparaît comme un homme d'une extrême sensibilité, qui porte à prendre les choses du mauvais côté; un homme privé de toute sens politique mais qui a un souci continuel de tenir son rang.

Comme le caractère de cette collection est assez divers (à côté de courts billets il y a des traités qui dépassent largement la longueur propre au genre épistolaire), la transmission de ces lettres est complexe. (L'éditeur a défendu avec succès l'authenticité de la première lettre.) L'introduction en donne une idée claire.

Les lettres publiées ici sont celles éditées par G. Pasquali, *Gregorii Nysseni Epistulae* (Berlin 1925, Leiden ²1959), c'est-à-dire 28 lettres de la main de Grégoire plus deux qui lui sont adressées. On ne trouve pas une mention de l'article de J.P. Pouchet, qui dans cette périodique (*Vig.Chr.* 42, 1988, 28-46) a défendu l'attribution de l'épître 124 du corpus basilien à Grégoire. Il aurait été intéressant de savoir l'opinion de l'éditeur à ce sujet. Mais peut-être qu'à ce temps le manuscrit était déjà terminé.

Le texte grêc a été imprimé d'une façon impeccable. (Lire Πέτρου au lieu de Πέτρον dans le titre de la dernière lettre.) La traduction est claire et exacte.

La lettre 13 'À Libanios' contient un passage intéressant, où Grégoire parle de l'instruction qu'il a reçue. Après avoir dit qu'il considère "Paul et Jean et les autres apôtres et prophètes" comme ses maîtres, il poursuit: εἰ δὲ περὶ τῆς ὑμετέρας λέγοις σοφίας, ... Évidemment il va traiter maintenant de ce qui est la propre *sophia* de Libanios, c'est-à-dire l'éloquence. Je ne suis pas sûr que 'sagesse' est ici la traduction requise. Liddle-Scot-Jones donne comme signification première du mot σοφία 'skill' (habilité ou art). Alors: "Si tu parles de ton art". (Il serait assez curieux de faire parler Libanios de sa propre *sagesse.*)

Que l'éditeur accepte cette petite remarque comme signe d'appréciation de son édition excellente.

2312 GD *Leiden*, Haarlemmerstraat 106B J.C.M. VAN WINDEN

Der Platonismus in der Antike. Band 2: H. Dörrie, Der Hellenistische Rahmen des kaiserzeitlichen Platonismus. Bausteine 36-72: Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar. Aus dem Nachlass herausgegeben und bearbeitet von Matthias Baltes unter Mitarbeit von Annemarie Dörrie und Friedhelm Mann. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstadt, Frommann-Holzboog, 1990. XVI, 531 S. Cloth DM 550,—.

Der zweite Band des von H. Dörrie geplanten Unternehmens 'eine möglichst vielschichtige Darstellung von Platons Erbe in den Jahrhunderten der Kaiserzeit' zu skizzieren, enthält eine Übersicht der Beurteilungen Platons und seiner Schriften in der genannten Periode. Die Titel der Kapitel mögen einen Eindruck des Inhalts geben: 'Platons Ansehen außerhalb der Akademie', 'Ausgaben der Werke Platons. Kritische Zeichen. Kanon der Lektüre', 'Urteile über Platons Stil', 'Legendarisches und Wunderbares in der biografischen Überlieferung über Platon', 'Platon und die Weisheit des Ostens'.

Für die Leser dieser Zeitschrift ist das letzte Kapitel besonders interessant, da man hier die Aussagen über Platon als Nachfolger des Moses zusammengestellt findet, die christlichen wie die ausserchristlichen (Aristoboulos, Flavius Josephus, Numenius; über die Aussage des Letzteren, dass Plato ein 'attisch schreibender Moses' wäre (vgl. S. 487), siehe jetzt auch *Vig.Chr.* 44, 1990, 64-75).

Wie schon in der Besprechung des ersten Bandes (*Vig.Chr.* 42, 1988, 206-7) dargelegt wurde, werden die sich auf dasselbe Thema beziehen-

den Texte als 'Bausteine' zusammengefügt. Neben dem Text findet sich eine deutsche Übersetzung. Diese ist überwiegend von Frau A. Dörrie angefertigt worden, wurde jedoch teilweise von M. Baltes überarbeitet. Die Autorschaft wird mittels Siglen angegeben. Die überarbeiteten Texte sind also mit 'A.D.-B.' versehen. Es ist jedoch nicht deutlich, was diese Bearbeitung beinhaltet, und auch nicht, ob die Autoren sich schliesslich über die gebotene Übersetzung einig waren.

Der zweite Teil des Buches (S. 223-520) enthält einen aufschlussreichen Kommentar. Die Verfasser sind sehr gewissenschaft in der Angabe gewesen, in wieweit der Text des Kommentars von H. Dörrie stammt, und wo er bearbeitet wurde. Die zahlreichen Hinzufügungen von den Verfassern sind in doppelten Klammern angegeben. Dies ist zwar deutlich, hat jedoch in ästhetischer Hinsicht den Wert des Buches nicht erhöht. Eine weniger auffällige Andeutung wäre angenehmer gewesen.

72 Bausteine sind bis jetzt behandelt worden, mehr als 200 stehen noch aus. Ich wünsche den Verfassern Ausdauer und guten Erfolg mit ihrem grossen Unternehmen.

2312 GD *Leiden*, Haarlemmerstraat 106B J.C.M. VAN WINDEN

S.Gregorio di Nissa, *La vita di S.Macrina* (Collana 'Letture cristiane del primo millennio' 4). Introduzione, traduzione e note di E. Giannarelli. Milan, Edizioni Paoline, 1988. 166 p.

In the introduction of his biography of the great Macrina, as he often calls his eldest sister, Gregory of Nyssa avails himself of the usual topoi of modesty: he intends to write in a simple manner, hoping that his story will be profitable for the readers. In truth he uses the full range of his rhetorical technique for this "chiara professione di fierezza aristocratica per la propria famiglia" (Momigliano). It has resulted in a fascinating document about feminine monasticism in the fourth century, in which the author's pride of family and ascetic piety are merged in an attractive and convincing manner.

Although modern translations are not lacking, they are by no means abundant and the new version under review is a welcome addition. In accordance with the scope of the series the translation is accompanied by a long scholarly introduction and many notes. In fact the only absentee is the Greek text itself. One wonders whether the standards

which have obviously been set for this series do not call for bilingual editions, provided, of course, that the costs could be limited. Be this as it may, Giannarelli's elucidations are quite useful, especially where the position of women in ancient society is concerned, and her rendering of Gregory's text is reliable. I would raise only one objection. G. follows A. Malingrey's relevant study (Paris 1961) when she explains the word φιλοσοφία and its cognates as referring to "la vita monastica di contemplazione, povertà, castità e preghiera" (53 n. 12), but in the translation in all cases she simply uses "filosofia". Only once, when rendering μετασχεῖν τῆς φιλοσόφου τραπέζης (GNO VIII 1.411.12 = SC 178, ch. 37.18), she departs from this course: "partecipare alla tavola monastica" (148). A comparable rendering would have been feasible in other cases too.

2353 BM *Leiderdorp*, van Effendreef 15 J. DEN BOEFT

W. Speyer, *Frühes Christentum im antiken Strahlungsfeld.* Ausgewählte Aufsätze (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 50). Tübingen, Mohr, 1989. 531 p.

Although the individual papers in this collection deal with an enormous variety of details, there is a definite unity of purpose, in that they nearly all concern the "Einkörperung antiker religiöser Symbole, Erlebnisinhalte, Vorstellungen und Gedanken in die christliche Botschaft" (4). The author is convinced of the existence of a "menschlich bedingte gemeinsame Raum der religiösen Sprache, in dem Altgläubige, Juden und Christen beheimatet sind" (6). This is very clearly brought out in the 34th paper, which is an "Originalbeitrag". Acknowledging the impossibility of one exclusively true explanation of the Last Supper—"Eine solche kann es nicht geben..." (491)—, he interprets Jesus' final meeting with his disciples as "Bündnis- und Schwurritus" (486). Such ideas are not due to any superficial syncretism on the part of the author, who regards the Christian religion as the fulfilment of much that was manifest in the "Formenreichtum der antiken Religionen" (492). Early Christianity underwent the manifold 'radiation' from Graeco-Roman culture and society, but not passively.

More than once in these papers Prof. Speyer, who is perhaps best known for his studies of pseudepigraphy and his lemmata in the RAC,

apart from his scholarly expertise shows a highly personal involvement in the general theme. This is especially the case in the 33rd paper. His answer to the question posed in its title is somewhat complicated inasmuch as he regards wrong tendencies in Renaissance and humanism as the main culprit of the "Versklavung der Natur" (472). Christianity, however, has failed to counter these tendencies and only a "neuer vergeistigter Gottesdienst" (475) can avert the catastrophe. Presumably this analysis will meet with stern opposition, but no one will reasonably disapprove of the union of vast learning with *sollicitudo pia* as such, provided the two are integrated, as they are here.

A period of 25 years (1963-1988) is covered by the articles, which are reproduced in the shape of their original publication, with 11 pages of additional material and the necessary indices.

Contents: Einleitung (1-6); 1. Zu den Vorwürfen der Heiden gegen die Christen (7-13): 2. Octavius, der Dialog des Minucius Felix: Fiktion oder historische Wirklichkeit? (14-20); 3. Religiöse Pseudepigraphie und literarische Fälschung im Altertum (21-58); 4. Der Tod der Salome (59-63); 5. Der bisher älteste lateinische Psalmus abecedarius. Zur Editio princeps von R. Roca-Puig (64-69); 6. Angebliche Übersetzungen des heidnischen und christlichen Altertums (70-85); 7. Die Legende von der Verbrennung der Werke Papst Gregors I (86-90); 8. Die Euphemia-Rede des Asterios von Amaseia. Eine Missionsschrift für gebildete Heiden (91-99); 9. Fälschung, pseudepigraphische freie Erfindung und "echte religiöse Pseudepigraphie" (100-139); 10. Religionen des griechisch-römischen Bereichs: Zorn der Gottheit, Vergeltung und Sühne (140-159); 11. Die Segenskraft des 'göttlichen' Fusses. Eine Anschauungsform antiken Volksglaubens und ihre Nachwirkung (160-175); 12. Zum Bild des Apollonius von Tyana bei Heiden und Christen (176-192); 13. Die Nachahmung von Tierstimmen durch Besessene. Zu Platon, resp. 3,396b (193-198); 14. Kaiser Nero in einer christlichen Legende (199-201); 15. Die leibliche Abstammung Jesu im Urteil der Schriftsteller der alten Kirche (202-219); 16. Der Ursprung warmer Quellen nach heidnischer und christlicher Deutung (220-227); 17. Neue Pilatus-Apokryphen (228-234); 18. Die Zeugungskraft des himmlischen Feuers in Antike und Urchristentum (235-253); 19. Religiös-sittliches und frevelhaftes Verhalten in seiner Auswirkung auf die Naturgewalten. Zur Kontinuität einer volkstümlichen religiösen Vorstellung in Antike und Christentum (254-263); 20. Die Geschichte vom Blinden und Lahmen (264-268); 21. Die Hilfe und Epiphanie einer Gottheit, eines Heroen und eines Heiligen in der Schlacht (269-291); 22. Der heilkundige Hippozentaur, Alexander der Grosse und Hippokrates. Ein neuer Text über die erste Offenbarung der Heilpflanzen (292-304); 23. Eine rituelle Hinrichtung des Gottesfeindes: Die Zweiteilung (305-321); 24. Die Vision der wunderbaren Höhle (322-331); 25. Das Weiblich-Mütterliche im christlichen Gottesbild (332-339); 26. Mittag und Mitternacht als heilige Zeiten in Antike und Christentum (340-352); 27. Realität und Formen der Ekstase im griechisch-römischen Altertum (353-368); 28. Der numinose Mensch als Wundertäter (369-394); 29. Das wahre Porträt (395-

401); 30. Das Verhältnis des Augustus zur Religion (402-430); 31. Spüren der 'Genesis' in Ovids Metamorphosen? (431-439); 32. Religiöse Betrüger. Falsche göttliche Menschen und Heilige in Antike und Christentum (440-462); 33. Hat das Christentum das Heutige Elend von Natur und Mensch mitverursacht? (463-476); 34. Das letzte Mahl Jesu im Lichte des sogenannten Eidopfers (477-492); Korrekturen und Nachträge (493-503); Bibliographische Nachweise (504-506); Stellenregister (507-510); Personen- und Sachregister (511-531).

2353 BM *Leiderdorp*, van Effendreef 15 J. DEN BOEFT

Wolfram Kinzig, *In Search of Asterius. Studies on the Authorship of the Homilies on the Psalms* (Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte, Band 47), Göttingen, 1990 (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht). 317 S., kart. 98.—DM.

Die von W. Kinzig, im folgenden K. genannt, vorgelegten Untersuchungen zielen auf eine Widerlegung von Marcel Richards und Eiliv Skards These, die (meisten der) 1956 herausgegebenen Homilien und Kommentarfragmenten zu Psalm 1-15 und 18 sowie der zugleich edierten Fragmente mit dem Lemma Asterius aus der auf das 6. Jahrhundert zurückgkehenden palästinensischen Katene zu Ps. 1-50 (Typ VI) seien dem Arianer Asterius Sophista zuzuschreiben (CPG 2815). Schon 1947 hatte M. Richard angekündigt, dass eine Analyse der genannten Texte »ein völlig neues Kapitel« zur bisherig bekannten Geschichte des Arianismus hinzufügen würde, und dies offenbar unter der Voraussetzung, dass man das Zeugnis von Philostorgius (H.E. II, 15; IV, 4, ed. Bidez, S. 25; 60) über die theologische Entwicklung des Asterius ernstnimmt und die genannten Texte der späten Lebenszeit desselben zuschreibt. Im Blick auf die in der Collectio enthaltenen Homilien zur Osteroktav hatte M. Richard präzisiert, dass die Textsammlung (»le recueil«) in der Zeit des Konstantius (vgl. Hieronymus, *De viris ill.*, 94, ed. Richardson, S. 46, 18-22) im Gebiet von Antiochien, also im westlichen Syrien, entstanden sei. Hatte M. Richard schon andeuten wollen, was s.E. das neue Kapitel über den Arianismus sein würde, wenn er insbes. die Interpretation von Ps. 8, 2a (Κύριε ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν, ὡς θαυμαστὸν κτλ.) in XVII, 9, S. 126, 16-17, als eine »charakteristische Ausage« zitierte? Dort heisst es nämlich: *Κύριε*, τῷ νόμῳ τῆς φύσεως, *ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν*, τῷ κάλλει τῆς προαιρέσεως. Im Rahmen einer christo- (und nicht theo-)zentrischen Exegese wird hier Christus als der göttliche Erlöser gesehen, der auf Grund sei-

ner eigenen freien Wahl »dem Willen des Vaters gehorsam« blieb und so »unser Herr« ist. Robert C. Gregg und Dennis E. Groh haben in ihrem Buch *Early Arianism—A View of Salvation*, London 1981, für die erste Generation der Arianer nachweisen wollen, dass ihre Theologie sich auf die hier angesprochene (dynamische, nicht »essentialistische«) Soteriologie konzentrierte, in deren Mittelpunkt Christi vollkommener Gehorsam als »Vor- und Urbild« von christlichem Leben, d.h. von »vollkommener Kreatürlichkeit«, steht. Asterius wurde hierbei nur zwei Mal gestreift, doch 1983 auf dem Oxforder Kongress durch Maurice F. Wiles in Zusammenarbeit mit Robert C. Gregg als Zeuge für diese neue erlösungs- und nur sekundär schöpfungstheologische Sicht der ersten Arianer vorgestellt (herausgegeben von R.C. Gregg in *Arianism, Historical and Theological Reassessments* [Patristic Monograph Series, NO. 11], Philadelphia, 1985, 111-151). Bei Richard P.C. Hanson fand diese These 1988 in *The Search of the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy 318-381*, Edinburgh 1988, einen positiven Widerhall. Nun aber versucht K. zu beweisen, dass die Zuweisung der von M. Richard 1956 edierten Texte an den Sophisten Asterius falsch sei, dass die vorgenannten Aussagen somit ein Konstrukt moderner Forschung, nicht aber Wiedergabe historischer Tatsachen seien.

In seiner Einleitung gibt K. zunächst eine Zusammenfassung zu Leben und Werk des Asterius Sophista (S. 14-21), die, wie es zu erwarten war, nicht über G. Bardy hinausführt, sodann eine Übersicht über die Geschichte der Verfasserfrage von J.-B. Cotelier bis E. Skard und M. Richard (S. 22-26) sowie einen Ausblick auf die Wirkungsgeschichte der Edition von 1956 (S. 27-37). Dann folgt der Beweisgang von K.: In einen ersten Schritt will er zeigen, dass nicht nur die meisten, sondern alle von M. Richard edierten Texte »eine Einheit bilden« (S. 41-67), um dann die Frage nach dem Autor (S. 69-157) aufzurollen. Dieser sei unbestritten ein Asterius, doch nicht mit dem arianischen Sophisten (und auch nicht mit dem Bischof von Amasea) identisch, sondern ein Anhänger des nikänischen Bekenntnisses, der zwischen 385 und 410 n.Chr. (S. 159-164) in Palästina oder, »was wahrscheinlicher ist« (S. 227), im westlichen Syrien, also im Raum von Antiochien die genannten Texte verfasst habe (S. 164-168). Letzteres wird durch einen Exkurs zum »Bibeltext des Asterius« (S. 169-225), jedoch genauer: zu den Psalmzitaten unter Absehen von allen im kritischen Apparat genannten Varianten (S. 182: *sic*), abgedeckt. Schliesslich nennt K. einige Asterii, unter denen man seinen Autor vielleicht finden könnte (S. 227-232). Es folgen Appendices (S. 233-270), eine Bibliographie (S. 271-290) und Indices (S. 291-317). — »Die Einheit des Textes« versucht K. mit dem Einsatz eines Computerprogramms in Anlehnung an Anthony Kenny und dessen »Stylometric Studies« zu beweisen. M. Richard hatte bei sechs Texten seiner Edi-

tion angemerkt, dass es ungewiss sei, ob sie ursprünglich zu der rekonstruierten Collectio gehörten. Für einen dieser Texte (I) hat Gilles Dorival inzwischen Zitate mit dem Lemma »Asterius« aus der handschriftlichen Überlieferung der Psalmkatenen (S. 132, Anm. 125) nachgewiesen; für einen zweiten (XIV) hatte M. Richard keine Begründung für seinen Zweifel genannt. Darum ordnet K. beide »dem 'genuinen' Teil des Corpus«, X genannt (S. 49), zu. Nun zeige ihm sein Computerprogramm, dass »the 'false' part of the corpus not attributed to AS (d.h. Asterius Sophista [Rez.]) by Richard«, Y genannt (= X; XXIV; XXVI; XXVII, 9-24), sich von X nicht unterscheide: »If Y contains passages not written by the author of X, they must be very small. Therefore the corpus is homogeneous« (S. 57). Vergleiche man beide Textgruppen, X und Y, jedoch mit anderen (nämlich [1] mit vier von C. Datema edierten Homilien des Asterius von Amasea [CPG 3260], [2] mit den von J. Liébaert herausgegebenen zwei arianischen Predigten [CPG 2082; 2083], [3] mit dem von M.J. Olivier edierten ersten Teil des Psalmenkommentars von Diodor von Tarsus [CPG 3818] bzw. mit zwei bei J.P. Migne stehenden Texten [*sic*], d.h. mit einer pseudo-chrysostomischen Predigt [CPG 4672], die an einer Stelle mit XXIX, 12 übereinkommt [S. 32], und mit den dort edierten Teilen des Psalmkommentars von Eusebius von Caesarea [CPG 3467]), dann zeige sich, dass sich X und Y deutlich von den anderen unterscheiden. Die hier genannten quantitativ arbeitenden »Stiluntersuchungen« benutzen sog. »function words«, d.h. Worte, von denen man annimmt, dass sie bei jedem Autor unabhängig (!) vom genus seines Textes in einer bestimmten konstanten Häufigkeit auftreten, m.a.W. für einen Autor, was er auch schreiben mag, spezifisch seien (S. 50-51), was K. in einer Anmerkung (31) selbst relativiert, weshalb er als Vergleichsmaterial Homilien und Kommentare gewählt habe. Solche »function words« seien Partikel, Konjunktionen, Negationen, ferner Präpositionen und verba dicendi, deren Auftreten, relativ zum betreffenden Textumfang (nach Anzahl von Worten) bestimmt, das Computerprogramm zu verschiedenen Rechenoperationen gebrauchte, die zwar in einer mathematischen Formel dem Leser in den Appendices bekanntgegeben, doch nicht in Umgangssprache erläutert werden. M.a.W.: was das Programm leistet, kann der normale Philologe nicht beurteilen und hat darum keinen Beweiswert. Es geht hier sicher nicht darum, nachvollziehen zu können, wie der Informatiker das Programm geschrieben hat, was ein eigenes Problem der Kooperation zwischen ihm und dem Philologen darstellt, sondern darum, dass »die philologische Idee«, die der Informatiker zu verarbeiten hat, in ihren einzelnen Schritten erläutert und begründet wird. Der Rez. erlaubt sich diese Kritik, sofern er sich mit analogen Problemen bei dem von A. Dees und dessen Mitarbeitern an der Vrije Universiteit in Amsterdam entwickelten Computerprogramm zur Rekonstruktion von Stemmata beschäftigt hat (vgl. z.B. JOB 39 [1989] 49-54).

Wenn K. die von M. Richard edierten Texte sowohl mit Homilien als mit Kommentaren verglichen hat, dann zeigt er ein gewisses Problembe-

wusstsein, ohne aber wirklich die Konsequenzen zu ziehen, die angebracht sind. In der Einleitung zu seiner Edition hatte M. Richard drei genera unterschieden, die in den Texten auftreten: »1. Die Exzerpte aus Kommentaren des Asterius, 2. Die Panegyrika für die Oktavfeier von Ostern. 3. Die Homilien ungewisser Herkunft«; ferner sprach er im Titel nicht nur von Kommentaren, sondern auch von »aliquot homiliae anonymae«, auch wenn er unglücklicherweise ansonsten stets von »homélie« spricht. Dies alles hat K. übersehen; hier hätten die Stiluntersuchungen von ihm einsetzen müssen. Denn Wörtchen wie z.B. γάρ oder ἀλλά, insbes. aber Partikel sind, wie K. in der oben zitierten Anmerkung ja selbst gesehen hat, in ihrer Häufigkeit nicht »genus-unabhängig«. Panegyriken lieben einen hymnischen, asyndetischen Stil, Kommentare aber wollen argumentativ auslegen. Es ist falsch, wenn K. also behauptet, M. Richard habe die Texte *commentarii* genannt (S. 115), und es ist nicht bewiesen, ja verkehrt, wenn er behauptet, es sei »auf Grund der Texte evident, dass sie ursprünglich Homilien waren« (ebd.). Darum wirft auch das Kapitel »Commentarii in Psalmos = Homilies on the Psalms?« (S. 115-122) nichts ab. Mit den Methoden exegetischer Kommentare, aber auch mit dem Vorgehen exegetischer Homilien hat sich K. nicht weiter beschäftigt. Und den Text des Asterius hat er ohne jede am literarischen genus orientierte Stiluntersuchung und Unterscheidung als »eine Einheit« seinem Rechenprogramm überlassen. Dass er aber zum Vergleich auch »Migne-Texte« herangezogen hat, ist peinlich; da er bei den anderen Texten jeweils von einer Untersuchung der lectiones variantes abgesehen hat, möchte der Rez. an die grundlegenden kritischen Bemerkungen über das Verhältnis von ediertem Text und kritischem Apparat bei stilistischen und sprachgeschichtlichen Studien erinnern, die J. Frösén, ein Schüler von H. Zilliacus, in *Prolegomena to a Study of the Greek Language in the First Centuries A.D.*, Helsinki 1974, vorgetragen hat und die verstärkt für die hier benutzten »function words« gelten.

Gleichsam als Anhang zu den quantitativen Stiluntersuchungen bietet K. für XXIV, XXVI, 1-3 und XXVII, 9-24 textimmanente Argumente für deren Zugehörigkeit zum »Corpus« (S. 59-67): Er verweist auf Paralleltexte. Für XXIV dürften diese Übereinkünfte zugleich mit der Tatsache, dass dieser Text zwar zu der Collectio gehört, aus der auch alle anderen edierten Strücke stammen, doch sicher nicht auf Johannes Chrysostomus zurückgehen kann, der Grund sein, warum M. Richard, wenn auch mit beachtlichem Vorbehalt, ihn in seine Ausgabe aufgenommen hat. Analoges gilt für XXVII, 9-24, will man hier nicht doch eine

dritte Quelle der Collectio annehmen. Anders steht es mit XXVI, 1-3. In XXVI, 3 werden Arius und Eunomius genannt, insbes. wird gegen beide (!) polemisiert, weil sie bei der Taufe das dreimalige Untertauchen durch eine einmalige Immersion ersetzt hätten. Seitdem seien sie τριάδος ἑτερουσίου παράσιτοι. Dies »kann sehr gut eine alte Interpolation sein«, urteilte M. Richard; doch könne man keine Zäsuren entdecken und auf jeden Fall lasse sich der gesamte Text dem Asterius nicht absprechen. Während nun M.F. Wiles und R.C. Gregg im oben zitierten Artikel (142 f), XXVI, 1-3 insgesamt als spätere Interpolation betrachten, will K. zeigen, dass dieser Text in seinem Zusammenhang mit XXVI, 4 »eine sorgfältig konstruierte Einheit« bilde und insgesamt zum ursprünglichen Wortlaut gehöre (S. 64). Diese These wird später (auf S. 142-145) eines seiner Hauptargumente dafür liefern, dass der Autor nicht mit dem Sophisten Asterius identisch sein kann.

Doch weder K. noch M.F. Wiles/R.C. Gregg beweisen, was sie behaupten, und M. Richards Position verdient bei genauer Betrachtung des Textes den Vorzug, auch wenn unmittelbar sichtbare Brüche nicht vorliegen. In XXVI, 4 folgen auf das Zitat von Ps. 14, 1b »Τίς παροικήσει ἐν τῷ σκηνώματί σου;« in Z. 10-14 bzw. Z. 15-22 *kurze* mit Τίς eingeleitete Fragen, durch die der zitierte Satz ausgelegt wird. Auch in XXVI, 3 folgt auf Ps. 14, 1b ein Τίς , auf das jedoch ein *langer* Satz folgt (S. 206, 22-27), der zu weiteren Aussagen überleitet. Im genannten Satz fallen zwei schwierige Lesarten auf: Zum ersten erwartet man statt eines μὴ σπιλώσῃ (Z. 25) ein οὐ σπιλώσει; die von M. Richard in Z. 22, wenn auch zögernd (»cunctanter«) eingeführte Konjektur ist keine Lösung, und so hat sie K. zurecht auf S. 142 weggelassen. Zum zweiten ist nicht klar, wie in Z. 26 μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων αἱρέσεων zu beziehen ist, das der Erwähnung des Arius und Eunomius vorausgeht. Was auf diesen Satz folgt, greift die Bildworte von der Kirche als ποιμνὴ καλή (Z. 23) und von der Taufe als σφραγὶς ἀνθηρά (Z. 25 mit Z. 23 und Z. 24) auf: Mit der einmaligen statt dreimaligen Immersion haben »Arius und Eunomius« beides verloren, »sind sie Parasiten der τριὰς ἑτεροούσιος geworden.« Und nun folgt ein Gegensatz zwischen zwei Gruppen: »Jene« (ἐκεῖνοι), also früher Genannte, werden »diesen« (τοῦτοι), also den gerade Genannten, gegenübergestellt: »Denn, wie für *jene* das Dogma ἑτεροούσιον ist, (so) ist es auch für *diese* die Taufe« (S. 207, 5-6). Der Satz ist m.E. *in sich* nicht verständlich; eines aber scheint klar: Mit »jene« weist er auf die in XXVI, 2 angesprochenen Neugetauften zurück, die nun in XXVI, 3, S. 207, 6-9 wieder so eingeführt werden, dass sich der Gedanke an XXVI, 2 anschliesst. Diese Beobachtungen sollten zur Vorsicht mahnen und dem Text von μετὰ (bzw. καὶ Εὐνομίου) bis Ἵνα οὖν (S. 206, 26-207,

6) und von ὡς bis πρόβατα (S. 207, 7-9) keine Beweislast zumuten, wenn es um die Verfasserfrage geht. Dass auch in XXVII, 8, S. 218,19 der Terminus ἑτεροούσιον begegnet, beweist entgegen dem, das K. auf S. 65 sagt, nichts, falls er seine eigene Argumentation auf S. 142 ernstnimmt. Die Aussage ist hier tatsächlich »somewhat obscure« und fällt nebenbei in ihrer *positiven* Formulierung am Ende einer Aufzählung von sechs in gleicher Weise *negativ* ausgedrückten Aussagen aus der Reihe: Sie sucht die Unbestimmtheit von ὁ μὴ ἀμβλυωπῶν aufzufüllen und könnte darum nachträglich hinzugefügt worden sein.

Der zweite Beweisschritt, die »Überprüfung von M. Richards Hypothese« bringt zunächst bezüglich der in den Katenen bezeugten Texte (S. 69-91) und der Textausgabe selbst (S. 91-113) nichts Nennenswertes, das über M. Richard hinausführen oder dessen Ausführungen in Frage stellen könnte. Deshalb erwartet der Leser alles, was dieses Buch rechtfertigen könnte, vom Kapitel: »A Comparison of the Theology of Asterius the Sophist and the Theology of the *Homilies on the Psalms*« (S. 125-157). Das Ergebnis lautet für K., dass entgegen dem oben genannten Artikel von M.F. Wiles und R.C. Gregg zwischen beiden Theologien keine Kompatibilität bestehe, da »in einigen Punkten« Widersprüche zwischen beiden nachweisbar seien (S. 153). Nun bietet die Darstellung der Theologie des Sophisten (S. 125-132) nach dem, was G. Bardy schon 1926 gesagt hat, nichts Neues. Zum Vergleich zwischen beiden Theologien (S. 135-150) liesse sich Vieles sagen; der Rez. möchte nur einiges, wenn auch Entscheidendes festhalten. (1) Von den drei zur Trinitätslehre zitierten Texten (S. 135-136) stellt keiner die Kompatibilität mit dem Fragment 20a des Sophisten, auf das sich K. hier bezieht, in Frage. (2) Beim dritten Text (XXI, 21, S. 168, 27-169, 5) stellt K. keinen Bezug zum Fragment 11 bzw. zur Argumentation von M.F. Wiles und R.C. Gregg her. Zu bedenken wäre hier auch Fragment 12 und, was G. Bardy (RHE 22 [1926] 264 f.) dazu gesagt hat. Ohne einen Beweis anzutreten, behauptet K. hier, man könne »aus dem Kontext« erschliessen, das der Autor sich keine »vom Vater unterschiedene und diesem untergeordnete Hypostase denken *kann*«. Wie bekannt, geht Asterius nirgends auf diese Frage ein: Es müsste also trotz des *silentium* ein Argument geliefert werden, dass der Autor irgendwo implizit voraussetzt oder »mitsagt«, dass er den (arianischen) Subordinatianismus ablehnt.

(3) Die Diskussion der Beziehung »Vater — Sohn« (S. 136-146) konzentriert sich auf zwei Stellen: I, 4-5, S. 2, 8-27; XVIII, 14, S. 132, 9-14. Im Aussang von einer Parallele zur erstgenannten Aussage (XVI, 6, S. 119, 8-9) hatte A. Grillmeier den »unarianischen« Charakter der von M. Richard edierten Texte abgeleitet: Ein ἀνεκφράστως bzw. ἀφράστως γεννηθείς sei im Munde eines Arianers nicht möglich. Nach dem, was M.F. Wiles und R.C. Gregg dazu bemerkt haben, wird dieses

Argument von K. fallen gelassen und statt dessen die Aussage λόγος δὲ ὡς ἀχώριστος τοῦ πατρός als Zeugnis dafür gewertet, dass der Autor sich zum Konzil von Nikaia bekenne. Dass diese Formel bei Athanasius (in einem ontologischen, »essentialistischen« Denken) begegnet, beweist aber nach Meinung des Rez. nicht, dass ein Subordinatianismus, wie er von den frühen Arianern (im Unterschied zum Eunomianismus) vertreten wurde, durch die zitierte Aussage von I, 4 verneint wird. Wie der Chorismos verstanden wird, den der Autor zwischen Vater und Logos ausschliesst, kann nicht präzis ausgemacht werden; doch eines ist deutlich: Es kann sich nicht um jenen ontologischen Chorismos handeln, der bei Athanasius das Verhältnis von Gott und Kreatur kennzeichnet. Denn es geht hier um die Interpretation von νόμος und λόγος in Ps. 1, 3a als christologische Titel; und der Kontext weist hier auf eine Willenseinheit von Vater und Logos: Christus ist νόμος, sofern er »die väterlichen Beschlüsse (= 'Ratschlüsse Gottes') in sich trägt«, λόγος aber, sofern er »vom Vater nicht getrennt werden kann«. An der zweiten Stelle, auf die K., wie gesagt, hier eingeht, erscheint ein ὁ τοῦ πατρὸς υἱὸς ὁμοούσιος, wo sich aber, wie schon M. Richard bemerkte, auf Grund des Kontextes statt ὁμοούσιος die Konjektur ἀγαπητός (nach Mark. 1, 11) nahelegt. Nun liest man an einer weiteren Stelle (XXXI, 5, S. 244, 16) in der einzigen »Corpushandschrift« (14./15. Jahrhundert), welche die 31. Homilie überliefert, ein ὁμοούσιος, während ein zweiter Zeuge, der aus dem 11. Jahrhundert stammende Codex Mosquensis Bibliothecae Synodalis 234 (VI. 217), statt dessen ein συνεργός ἐστιν überliefert, das sich in den Zusammenhang gut einfügt. Nun hat M. Richard leider nur jene Varianten aufgezählt, in denen er dem Moskauer Kodex und nicht der »Corpushandschrift« den Vorzug gibt und zugleich nur ganz allgemein angemerkt, dass die Textgestalt des Mosquensis im Vergleich mit dem anderen Zeugen weniger gut sei. Ohne Kollation ist deshalb eine recensio codicum hier nicht möglich. Anderseits hätte K. ein Blick in A. Ehrhards Werk zur *hagiographischen und homiletischen Überlieferung* (II, 103-104) und in einige kritische Editionen, die den Mosquensis benutzt haben, warnen müssen, die Frage mit der Bemerkung abzuschieben, dieser Kodex sei »nicht sehr zuverlässig« (S. 141). Der Kürze halber verwiest der Rez. nur auf die Edition der Predigten des Leontius von Konstantinopel, die C. Datema and P. Allen (CCSG 17, Turnhout — Leuven 1987) vorgelegt haben. Diese vom Iviron-kloster auf dem Athos nach Moskau gekommene Handschrift steht überlieferungsgeschichtlich dem Translitterationsvorgang in Konstantinopel nahe und

scheint sowohl dem Vindobonensis theol. gr. 5, einer Prachthandschrift des Patriarchats aus dem Jahre 948, als auch dem Modell des Ottobonianus gr. 14 und zweier verwandter Handschriften überlegen zu sein (vgl. vom Rez. in: Byzantion 59 [1989] 291-353, bes. 296-320).

(4) Man wird K. darin folgen können, dass in XVII, 1-2, S. 123, 11-21 kein Hinweis dafür vorliegt, dass der Verf. einst Apostat gewesen und dann zur kirchlichen Gemeinschaft zurückgekehrt ist (S. 154-155); doch kann der Rez. ihm nicht bei seiner Interpretation (S. 153-154) der oben schon zitierten Stelle XVII, 9, S. 126, 16-17 folgen, in der M. Richard ein Zeugnis arianischer Soteriologie erkannt hatte. Denn es ist eine Methode des Asterius, verschiedene Deutungen für ein und dasselbe Psalmwort aneinanderzureihen; und den Beweis, dass es sich hier an der genannten Stelle anders verhält, dass nämlich die Aussage von Z. 16-17 zu den Zeilen 11-15 parallel gebaut ist und deren Aussage »wiederholt«, hat K. nicht bringen können.

(5) Auch die Lesart ὁ μονογενὴς θεός von Joh. 1,18 beweist an sich, wie K. zurecht sage, nicht, dass ein Text arianischer Provenienz ist (S. 153). Entscheidend ist auch für diese Frage der Kontext: Wird die Formel für den Logos gewissermassen als Titel und eindeutig im Gegensatz zu ὁ θεός, dem absolut transzendenten Vater, gebraucht, dann kann dies der Darstellung einer subordinatianischen, darum auch einer arianischen Christologie dienen. Verkehrt ist die Behauptung, in XVI, 8, S. 125, 26 finde sich die Lesart ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός (S. 153, Anm. 336); übersehen hat K., dass Markell von Ankyra in dem ihm von M. Richard zugeschriebenen Brief (?) *De sancta ecclesia* (CPG 2802), der bei K. hier nicht zitiert wird, ausdrücklich sagt: Διὸ καὶ πάλιν πρὸ αἰώνων ἀναπλάττουσι δεύτερον θεὸν ὑπὸ πατρὸς γεγεν<ν>ῆσθαι, ὡς ὁ πρόκριτος παρ' αὐτοῖς Ἀστέριος ἔφη διδαχθεὶς ὑπὸ Ἑρμοῦ τοῦ ἐπικληθέντος Τρισμεγίστου ... ὅθεν αὐτῷ καὶ »*ὁ μονογενὴς θεός*« παρὰ τὸν θεῖον Ἰωάννην λέγοντα »*υἱὸν μονογενῆ*« προσερρύη (10, ed. G. Mercati, S. 97). Markell, der ja ein polemisches Werk gegen Asterius Sophista geschrieben hatte, empfand diese Lesart von Joh. 1,18 als etwas Typisches für den Arianismus des Asterius. Zu den von M. Richard herausgegebenen Texten ist festzuhalten, dass sich in ihnen keine ausdrückliche Aussage über das Verhältnis Christi als Schöpfer und Erlöser zu Gott-Vater findet; wenn man darin, dass Christus, der Schöpfer und Erlöser, eindeutig als Gott angesprochen wird, einen Beweis sieht, dass der Verf. kein Arianer sei, dann zielt dies, wie soeben mit Markell angedeutet, zu kurz. Kennzeichend für die Christologie dieser Texte ist, dass sie einzig das Logos-Sarx-Schema kennen und die Seele Christi keine theologische Grösse darstellt.

(6) Wenn es S. 147 heisst: »It was shown above that AS (= Asterius Sophista [Rez.]) referred Ps 109:3 explicitly to the generation of the preexistent Christ (frg. 23), unlike Ast« (= unser Text), so ist die erste Aussage zum einen auf S. 130 nicht bewiesen (und einen anderen Bezugspunkt hat der Rez. nicht gefunden); denn Ps. 109, 3 wird vom Sophisten nicht in Fragment 23, wo schlicht die These einer »Zeugung vor den Aionen« ohne Begründung erscheint, sondern in Fragment 24 zitiert, wo es um die Variante ἐγέννησα geht, die der Sophist nach Markell der Lesart ἐξεγέννησα vorzieht, weil er so das, was Markell präzis ablehnt, besser zeigen könne: die ἀρχαῖα ἄνω γέννησις (überliefert scheint: ἀρχαῖα ἀναγέννησις). Für Markell gab es keine Zeugung in der immanenten Trinität, sondern nur eine einzige in der Jungfrauengeburt. M.a.W. vom Sophisten wird nach den uns erhaltenen Fragmenten Ps. 109, 3 wohl zitiert, aber die insinuierte Interpretation von πρὸ τοῦ ἑωσφόρου durch πρὸ αἰώνων lässt sich indirekt als Voraussetzung für die Argumentation in Fragment 24 aufweisen, das bei K. nicht besprochen wird. Andersiets fällt die Differenz zwischen diesem Fragment und einer Stelle in dem von M. Richard edierten Text auf: Dort wird Ps. 109, 3 in der auffallenden, doch nicht nur hier bezeugten Lesart ἐκ γαστρὸς Μαριὰμ ἐγέννησά σε zitiert und auf die Jungfrauengeburt gedeutet (XVIII, 15, S. 132, 24-133, 1). Die Berufung auf den hebräischen Wortlaut zeigt, dass der Ausgangspunkt eine Transskription für das im Griechischen mit ἐκ γαστρός Wiedergegebene war (vgl. S. 199 f.) Dass hier πρὸ τοῦ ἑωσφόρου weggelassen wird, ist im Kontext begreiflich. Denn das Verhältnis der zwei γεννήσεις — »vor den Aionen« und »aus der Jungfrau« — zueinander, wird hier nicht reflektiert. Darum bedarf die Interpretation von Prov. 8, 23.25 in XXI, 12, S. 165, 6-11, wird sie in diesen Zusammenhang gestellt (S. 146), eine ausführliche Diskussion: immerhin wird die Zeugung in der Präexistenz hier als »erster Tag« bezeichnet. Hier scheint doch eine erste ordnende Differenz eingetragen zu werden. Der Hinweis, dass der *locus classicus* arianischen Subordinatianismus, Prov. 8, 22, nicht zitiert wird, beweist nicht mehr als ein *argumentum e silentio* »beweisen« kann.

(7) Wenn K. die von M. Richard edierten Texte auf die Zeit zwischen 385 und 410 datieren will (S. 159-164), so kann man in seiner Argumentation wohl erkennen, wie er den terminus post quem, nicht aber, wie er jenen ante quem gewinnt: Die ersten beiden Argumente (II, 21, S. 13, 8-10: Amnestie für Gefangene an Ostern; XII, 4, S. 83 und XXVII, 2, S. 215, 13-19: Praxis der Kindertaufe) sind wiederum nichts anderes als *argumenta e silentio*. Das dritte, nämlich die Gewohnheit, während der Osteroktav (täglich) für die Neugetauften zu predigen, spricht eher gegen die Daterung von K. — Wenn der Rez. der Frühdatierung von M. Richard den Vorzug gibt, so ist er sich, wie er oben zu XXVI, 1-3 und zum ὁμοούσιος in XVIII, 14 und XXXI, 5 schon ausführte, bewusst, dass der überlieferte Text Spuren oberflächlicher Redaktion aus späteren

Zeiten aufweist. Man kann nicht erwarten, dass eindeutig arianische Aussagen (ausserhalb eines kontroverstheologischen, gegen den Arianismus gericheten Zusammenhangs) durch orthodoxe Kopisten für die Nachwelt überliefert werden. Hier liegt bei diesen Texten die Grenze einer Argumentation »für« und »wider« M. Richard. Wenn K. schreibt: »The hypothesis of Richard must therefore be seen as having been refuted« (S. 157), so dürfte dies nach allem, was hier erörtert wurde, vorschnell gewesen sein. Wichtig wird für die künftige Forschung vor allem K.s Exkurs über die Psalmzitate (S. 176-225) bleiben.

Vrije Universiteit, *Amsterdam* KARL-HEINZ UTHEMANN

Alan F. Segal, *Paul the Convert. The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee.* Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 1990. XVI + 368 pages, $ 35.00.

This is by far the best book about Paul I have ever read: it revolutionizes Pauline studies. Its author is professor of the Old Testament and Judaism at Barnard College (Columbia University, New York). He wrote his dissertation, *Two Powers in Heaven* (1977), on the Jewish concept of the Angel of the Lord, who by some Jews, including Philo, was considered to be a 'second God'. In his book *Rebecca's Children* (1986) he described Christianity and later Judaism as hostile siblings. Now he argues that Paul was a mystic (or should we say: a gnostic?) who should be interpreted in the perspective of works like Shiur Qoma and Merkabah writings, not mentioned even once in Kittel's *Dictionary of the New Testament.* Like them, Paul is indebted to the traditions about the *kabod*, the Glory of God described by the prophet Ezekiel. Of course, Segal admits that Paul lived in an active apocalyptic environment, sharing many of its assumptions. But he knows that our understanding of apocalypticism has changed enormously over the past few years by the renewal of research in non-canonical Jewish literature, by the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, and by the work of Gershom Scholem, who has shown that Jewish mysticism was a central part of apocalypticism. Scholars have recognized the ecstatic and mystical core of apocalypticism, revising their understanding of these ancient phenomena. Paul's writing fits especially well into the reinterpreted apocalypticism. The center of Paul's gospel is the identification of Jesus as the *kabod*, the luminous human Glory of God.

According to Segal, Philo has the same irrational, imaginative, mythological background. Like the Alexandrian poet *Ezekiel tragicus*, Philo speaks of Moses as being made into a divinity, he says that Jacob saw only the archangel, that is the *logos*, in whose form God reveals himself, he calls the heavenly Man the image (*eikon*) of man and, as said above, the *logos* a second God. Philo himself cannot possibly be the author of these traditions. Similar views are to be found in the *Angelic Liturgy* from Qumran, which evinces some of the most characteristic aspects of Jewish mysticism in an apocalyptic community of the first century.

Upon this canvas Segal paints his picture of Paul the Jew, a convert from one Jewish sect to another, always remaining (like Akiba) a Pharisee in his interpretation of Scripture, though (like Acher) an apostate, whose personal religious experience inspired his views on circumcision, the dietary laws and the salvation of Israel. Paul's spiritual experience, an experience closely paralleled by Jewis mysticism, forms the basis for his thinking.

This study is the mature fruit of a new development in the study of Early Christianity, both Gnostic and Catholic.

It all began with a casual remark in this review (17, 1963, 50-54) to the effect that the gnostic and hermetic Anthropos referred to the *kabod* in the form of Man in Ezekiel's first chapter. This was followed by an article on Ezekiel 1, 26 in Jewish mysticism and Gnosis (*VC* 34, 1980, 1-13), a summary of a longish contribution to ANRW (forthcoming). A decisive step was taken when Gruenwald antedated the history of Jewish mysticism by three centuries by observing that Moses' vision of *Phos* (Man) in *Ezekiel tragicus* is the oldest evidence for mystical speculations about the *kabod* (*Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism*, Leiden 1980, 128, a book not mentioned by Segal).

Jarl Fossum found that the Jewish Christian prophet Elchasai saw Christ as a figure similar to a Man with enormous proportions, like the *kabod* of Shiur Qoma (*VC* 37, 1983, 260-287). He discovered many parallels for this in Samaritan and Jewish writings in his book *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord* (Tübingen 1985). Kim applied the new insights to Paul, without acknowledgment (*The Origin of Paul's Gospel*, Tübingen 1984).

Van der Horst had to recant his faulty interpretation of Ezekiel the Dramatist (*JJS* 34, 1983, 21-29) and admitted that the divine Man of the two Ezekiels and the Son of Man referred to the same figure

(*Mnemosyne* 37, 1984, 354-375). Cary Newman too sees Paul in the light of the Old Testament "Glory of God" and distinguishes between a Royal Glory construal (*kabod* in temple), a Prophetic Glory construal (calling by vision) and (latest of all) the Sinai Glory construal (theophany to Moses), which all three are relevant for Paul (*Glory of God in the face of Jesus*, Ann Arbor 1989). So Segal's work is the consummate result of a recent development which has not met with serious opposition and has been very well received by the critics.

A few questions remain. Is Paul's heavenly journey to Paradise and the third heaven Judaic, or rather Hellenistic? Segal quotes the *Poimandres*, so deeply influenced by esoteric Judaism. But there the ascent takes place after death. In the Coptic Hermetic writing called *The Discourse on the Eighth and the Ninth*, which shows no traces of Jewish lore, the ascent and the visionary experience take place during the life of the initiate. In this writing Hermes Trismegistos, considered to be a king of ancient Egypt, identifies himself with the Spirit (*Nous*, God). This certainly is a valid parallel for Paul's visionary experience. It is true that *First Enoch* 37-71 contains the (pre-Christian) narration of the transformation of Enoch into the Son of Man. But where did this concept of the God-man originate? Moreover, Paul never uses the Aramaic expression 'Son of Man', but calls Christ 'the second Man from heaven' (1 *Cor.* 15, 47), just as the author of the *Poimandres* speaks about the *Anthropos* (from heaven) and Ezekiel Tragicus about *Phos*, Man. And *Adam Qadmon* of *Kabbalah* is first attested in certain Jewish Gnostic writings from Nag Hammadi, in the form of *Ger(aios) Adam*.

But these are minor objections to a great achievement. Segal has made Paul, and Early Christianity, more understandable and therefore deserves the heartfelt thanks of all believers and unbelievers.

3722 BR *Bilthoven*, Noordhoudringelaan 32 GILLES QUISPEL

C. Wilfred Griggs, *Early Egyptian Christianity from its origins to 451 C.E.* Leiden, Brill.

According to the author of this book Christianity was introduced into Egypt already during the first century of the Christian Era and remained undifferentiated until Demetrius, the first monarchic bishop (± 200), imposed Catholic ecclesiasticism upon it under the influence of the

West. This created a tension between the hierarchy and the intellectuals of the catechetical school within Alexandria (Origen!), but also between Greek Alexandria and the largely Coptic hinterland, until Athanasius and his successors cemented the bond of the monastic movement, which was originally independent of Catholicism, to the ecclesiastical Church.

It is ironic that the Alexandrian bishops' international influence should decline just at the time their control over the discrete elements of Egyptian Christendom was finally becoming a reality. The Nestorian controversy in the fifth century brought into focus all the political and religious differences between Alexandria and the sees of Constantinople and Antioch. The Council of Chalcedon (451) and its aftermath saw the separation of Egyptian Christianity from the Catholic Church. In addition to a nationalistic response to the demotion of Alexandria from first city in the East, a subsequent de-Hellenisation accompanied the establishment of the Monophysite theology. In the centuries following Chalcedon the Egyptian Christians became even more united than before and the resulting unity became the national Egyptian (Coptic) Church which exists up till the present day.

Griggs could have been more specific about the rise and fall of the Church in Egypt. According to the Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies* (1, 9, 1) "a Hebrew man called Barnabas", coming from Jerusalem and sent by Peter, was the first to preach the Gospel in Alexandria. That is an extremely trustworthy tradition, because it contradicts the official version, according to which Mark, the author of the Gospel, had come from Rome to found the Church there. There is every reason to suppose that Egyptian Christianity is of Palestinian origin. This would explain the adoptianist Christology of the great teachers within the Alexandrian Church, Basilides, Valentinus and Carpocrates, who need not to be whitewashed, as Grigg does, but should be seen in the right perspective.

The same Pseudo-Clementine writings show how and why this Judaic religion had to be expressed in Greek:

> *sed quia ipse (Petrus) de caelestibus loqui convenit, ego (Clemens) de his quae ad Graecorum loquacitatem pertinent, respondebo. Postea vero quam a nobis Graecorum more fuerit disputatum ... tunc ipse ... patefaciet veritatem (Recognitiones* VIII, 5).

Ideally this is very true and tells the history of the Egyptian Church in a nutshell. Griggs does not cite the Clementine writings even once.

Moreover, the separation from Catholicism was not exclusively due to political reasons and clerical ambition. Monophysitism originates in

the Christology of Athanasius, who long thought that Christ had no human soul. It seems to me that this theology, which is neither Jewish nor Greek, but Levantine, is deeply rooted in the overwhelming religious experience of the divine presence in the Eucharist, which inspires awe by its tremendous majesty. Even today the Coptic liturgy has this effect upon the believers. How else can one explain that this religion spread like a moor fire to Armenia, parts of Mesopotamia, Syria, the Lebanon (but not Palelstine where the Christians of Jewish nationality ["Palestinians", "Arabs"] were and are Greek Orthodox), Egypt, Nubia, Ethiopia. This split was the greatest catastrophe that ever befell Christianity, compared with which the Protestant Reformation was no more than a minor housefire. As I see it, all this happened because the variety of religious experience was not properly understood and acknowledged at the time.

Mr. Grigg, who was a member of an excavation team at Nag Hammadi in 1975, is very sceptical about the fantastic stories concerning the discovery of the wellknown codices there in 1945. The discoverer, the blood-avenger Muhammed Ali, could not be enticed to return to the site of the discovery until thirty years later. Excavations yielded nothing at all. No archaeological evidence has been found supportive of any of the stories associated with the discovery. Other Coptisants have made it known that they do not believe a word of what James Robinson recorded. That these Gnostic books were written in a monastery, is not certain, according to Grigg. It is true that the expression "Coptic Gnostic Library" is a misnomer. The collection contains Catholic, Jewish Christian, Encratitic, Jewish, Platonic and also "Gnostic" writings. Therefore it remains possible that these beautiful books were written in the *scriptorium* of a nearby monastery. After all, also a virtual Gnostic like Euagrius Ponticus lived among Egyptian monks at about the same time. And Muhammad Ali ruefully admitted to me personally that his mother had burned some papyri lying in the court near the stove (they had no house), when he was in prison for having killed the alleged murderer of his father.

On page 238 the author tells the reader that Jean Doresse published his dissertation on *Apocryphon Johannis* at the University of Copenhagen in 1963. I always thought that it was Sören Giversen, now professor of the New Testament at the University of Aarhus, who wrote that book. The editor of the series, Martin Krause, should have corrected this howler.

3722 BR *Bilthoven*, Noordhoudringelaan 32 GILLES QUISPEL

BOOKS RECEIVED

The inclusion of a book in this list, which contains all books received by the editors, does not guarantee its subsequent review.

Robert Beulay, L'enseignement spirituel de Jean de Dalyatha. Mystique syro-oriental du VIIIe siècle. Avant-propos de Antoine Guillaumont (Théologie Historique 83). Paris, Beauchesne, 1990. 523 p. 330 F.

Helmut Koester, Ancient Christian Gospels. Their History and Development. SCM Press Ltd. 26-30 Tottenham Road, London N1 4BZ.

Karin Alt, Philosophie gegen Gnosis. Plotins Polemik in seiner Schrift II 9. Akademie der Wissenschaften und Literatur, Mainz. Abh.d. Geistes- und Sozialwiss. Klasse 1990 Nr. 7. Stuttgart, Franz Steiner Verlag. 74 S. DM 36,—.

Michel Aubineau, Chrysostome, Sévérien, Proclus, Hésychius et alii: Patristique et Hagiographie grecques. Inventaires de manuscrits, Textes inédits, Traductions, Études. Variorum Reprints. London, 1988. XVI, 366 p. 30 articles d'un auteur fameux, dispersés en 23 Revues, Mélanges et Actes de congrès, qui ont été publiés de 1972 à 1981.

Jean Chrysostome, Trois catéchèses baptismales. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes par Auguste Piédagnel, avec la collaboration de Louis Doutreleau, s.j. (Sources Chrétiennes 366). Paris Les Édition du Cerf, 1990. 286 p. 200 F.

Maximi Confessoris Quaestiones ad Thalassium II: Quaestiones LVI-LXV, una cum latina interpretatione Ioannis Scotti Eriugenae iuxta posita, ed. Carl Laga et Carlos Steel (Corpus Christianorum. Series Graeca 22). Turnhout, Brepols/Leuven, University Press, 1990. LX, 363 p.

A. H. Armstrong, Hellenic and Christian Studies. Variorum 1990. XII, 317 p.

Beringerius Turonensis, Rescriptum contra Lanfrannum, herausgegeben von R.B.C. Huygens (Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Mediaevalis LXXXIV) und idem, Faksimileausgabe der Handschrift Wolfenbuttel, mit einer Einleitung von Wolfgang Milde (C.C. C.M. LXXXIV A). Turnholti, Brepols, 1988.

Sebastian Greiner, Gewissheit der Gebetserhörung. Eine theologische Deutung. Communio, Köln, 1990. 292 S.

Mélanges T.J. van Bavel, publiés par B. Bruning, M. Lamberigts, J. van Houtem (Collectanea Augustiniana 1990 et 1991). 2 vol. 1074 p. Institut Historique Augustinien, Leuven.

E. P. Sanders, Paul (Past Masters Series). Oxford, University Press, 1991. 138 p. £ 4.99.

William S. Babcock (ed.), Paul and the Legacies of Paul. Southern Methodist University Press, Dallas, 1990.

Eberhard Schockenhoff, Zum Fest der Freiheit. Theologie des christlichen Handelns bei Origenes (Tübinger Theologische Studien 33). Matthias-Grünewald-Verlag, Mainz, 1990. 352 S. DM 68,—.

S.A. Panimolle, Gesú di Nazaret nell' ultimo evangelo e nei primi scritti dei Padri. Edizione Borla, via delle Fornaci 50, 00165 Roma. 1990. 451 p. L 50.000.

Giuseppe Visonà, Citazioni patristische e critica testuale neotestamentaria. Il caso di Lc 12,49 (Analecta Biblica 125). Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, Roma, 1990. 80 p. L. 18.500.

Vigiliae Christianae 45 (1991), 209-222, E. J. Brill, Leiden

CITATIONS DE L'HOMÉLIE DE PROCLUS, *IN NATIVITATEM SALVATORIS* (CPG 5068), DANS UN FLORILÈGE CHRISTOLOGIQUE DES IVe ET Ve SIÈCLES.

PAR

MICHEL AUBINEAU

Le *Paris. gr.* 1491 (s.X) contient, dans ses folios 200v-207v, sous le nom de «Proclus, archevêque de Constantinople», un très long texte *Sur la nativité du Seigneur*. «Titre trompeur», écrivait en 1941 l'éditeur de ce florilège, le Père Charles Martin. «En réalité», continue-t-il, «sous l'apparence d'une seule homélie appartenant à Proclus, se cache un conglomérat de cinq ou six courtes pièces, toutes relatives à la Nativité, dont l'étendue et l'auteur ne se laissent pas toujours préciser de façon absolument certaine.» D'où le titre donné à sa publication par l'heureux découvreur: Un Florilège grec d'homélies christologiques des IVe et Ve siècles sur la Nativité (Paris. gr. 1491).[1]

I. *Le contenu du Florilège christologique.*

Voici l'inventaire du Florilège,[2] établi par Martin, il y a un demi siècle, enrichi de quelques références à des études récentes.

SECTION I. Proclus, Hom. XXIV, *De natiuitate Domini* (cf. CPG 5823).

Texte grec: Florilège 40-43; texte doublé par deux versions anciennes, syriaque et copte, transmises sous le nom de Proclus; homélie citée sous ce nom par la *Doctrina Patrum*. Toutes références utiles dans Geerard, CPG. Date proposée par M. Richard[3]: 25 décembre 430.

SECTION II. Proclus, Hom. XXIII, *De dogmate Incarnationis*. (Cf. CPG 5822).

Texte grec: Florilège 44-48; texte doublé par deux versions anciennes, l'une syriaque (en double recension) et l'autre copte, transmises sous le nom de Proclus; homélie citée en grec, toujours sous le nom de Proclus, par la *Doctrina Patrum* et par Éphrem d'Antioche (Photius). Lieu: dans la Grande église de Constantinople, en présence de Nestorius. Date[4]: à

l'entrée du Carême (notre Quinquagésime); précision de Richard: 28 février / 1er mars 431.

SECTION III. Centon anonyme de l'homélie *In natalem Christi diem*, attribuée à Jean Chrysostome (PG 56, 385-394. Cf. CPG 4560).

Texte grec: Florilège 48-52, avec, imprimés en regard, les passages correspondants de l'homélie.

L'homélie a été citée par Cyrille d'Alexandrie dans son *De recta fide ad reginas* (PG 76, 1216 AB), donc antérieurement à 430.

Elle est attribuée à Chrysostome par Cyrille d'Alexandrie et le *Florilège d'Édesse*, par les manuscrits grecs, par les versions orientales (sauf par la version arménienne, qui invoque abusivement Grégoire le Thaumaturge). Ch. Martin[5] plaidait vigoureusement en faveur de Chrysostome, en raison notamment de formules christologiques qui rappellent celles des théologiens d'Antioche au IVe siècle.

Dans un long dossier, dense, bien argumenté, R. Caro[6] plaide en faveur de Proclus. Opinion qui lui semble, malgré les objections émises, «plus probable» que la précédente, favorable à Chrysostome. En l'absence d'édition critique, on ne peut définitivement trancher, mais j'incline du côté de Caro. Le style de l'homélie est en effet beaucoup plus proche de celui de Proclus. L'objection tirée de la «tonalité antiochienne» perdrait de son poids si l'homélie exploitée dans le centon remontait à la jeunesse oratoire de Proclus, bien avant la controverse nestorienne. On comprendrait que Cyrille ait pu lire ce texte avant 430, sans s'offusquer de ces formules, en se méprenant de surcroît sur l'auteur.

SECTION IV. Laissons ici la parole à Martin: «Une courte homélie ou fragment d'homélie ...Nous ne sommes pas encore parvenu à identifier cette courte section de notre compilation. Elle doit vraisemblablement provenir d'un auteur de la fin du IVe ou de la première moitié du Ve siècle. Proclus lui-même ne semble nullement exclu. Un heureux hasard permettra peut-être, un jour, de donner de plus amples éclaircissements sur ce texte.»[7]

Texte grec: Florilège, 52-53.

Le présent article apporte une réponse au Père Martin. Avant d'aborder le sujet, achevons l'inventaire du Florilège.

SECTION V. Une courte homélie, *In principio erat Verbum*, apparentée à celles de Paul d'Émèse.

Texte grec: Florilège 53-56.

Homélies de Paul d'Émèse, *De natiuitate* (PG 77, 1433-1444; ACO,

I, 1, 4, pp. 9-14), prêchées en présence de Cyrille, à Alexandrie, les 25 décembre et 1er janvier 433 (cf. CPG 6365-6366). Le Père A.- J. Festugière a donné une traduction française de ces deux textes: *Éphèse et Chalcédoine. Actes des conciles* (Paris 1982) 477-483.

SECTION VI. Antiochus de Ptolémaïde, fragment d'une homélie, *De natiuitate*. (Cf. CPG 4296).

Texte grec: Florilège 56-57.

Identification fondée sur deux citations, latines, recueillies dans le Florilège annexé au *De duabus naturis* du pape Gélase.

Repère chronologique: Antiochus, adversaire de Chrysostome, mourut sous le règne d'Arcadius, donc au plus tard en Avril 408.

Martin hésite sur le tracé de frontière entre les sections V et VI.

II. *Parallèles littéraux entre l'homélie de Proclus*, In natiuitatem Saluatoris (CPG 5068) *et la section IV du Florilège publié par Martin*.

En ce qui concerne l'homélie, voir deux articles récents:

M. Aubineau et Fr.- J. Leroy, Une homélie grecque inédite, pour le jour de Noël, attribuée à Jean Chrysostome (BHG 1920q, CPG 5068), *Orpheus* N.S. 10 (1989) 392-403. Cf., en note, quelques «retractationes»[8].

M. Aubineau, Restitution d'un Ps.-Chrysostome, *In natiuitatem Saluatoris* (CPG 5068), récemment édité, à Proclus de Constantinople, *Orpheus* 11 (1990) 84-110. Cf. «errata et corrigenda»[9].

Les renvois au texte grec de l'homélie (*Orpheus* 1989), seront faits aux n^os^ des lignes. Les renvois au Florilège Martin (*Muséon* 54, 1941) seront faits aux lignes de la section IV. Les mots communs à l'homélie et au florilège seront soulignés d'un tiret horizontal.

A

Homélie, linn. 59-61:

῞Ιδωμεν ἡμῶν τὴν ἐλπίδα,
ἴδωμεν τὸν πάντων δεσπότην δούλου μορφὴν εἰληφότα,
ἴδωμεν τὸν ἐν κόλποις τοῦ Πατρὸς σήμερον ἐκ Μαρίας τικτόμενον καὶ τὸν ἀντίπαλον ἀναιροῦντα.

Florilège IV, 1-6:

῞Ιδωμεν ἡμῶν τὰς ἐλπίδας σήμερον ἐν ἑνὶ βρέφει κείμενας,
ἴδωμεν τῶν πάντων δεσπότην δι' ἡμᾶς ἐν δούλου μορφῇ γενόμενον,
ἴδωμεν τῶν πάντων καθηγητὴν ἐν φάτνῃ κείμενον,
ἴδωμεν τὸν ἐν κόλποις τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐν κόλποις Μαρίας, οὐ γυμνώσαντα τὸν

Πατέρα, οὐ περιγραφέντα ἐν Μαρίᾳ, οὐ συσταλέντα ἐν φάτνῃ, οὐ μερισθέντα ἐν Βηθλεέμ, ἀλλ' ἀεὶ ὄντα καὶ παντὶ παρόντα.

Noter la juxtaposition des anaphores fondées sur ἴδωμεν (trois dans l'homélie, quatre dans le Florilège). Le compilateur emprunte littéralement certains membres de phrases, non sans amplifier parfois.

B

Homélie: linn. 61-63, sans correspondant dans le Florilège.

C

Homélie, lin. 63:

Κατῆλθεν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καὶ οὐκ ἀφῆκεν τὸν Πατέρα ἄτεκνον.

Florilège IV, 7-8:

Κατῆλθεν γὰρ ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ καὶ οὐκ ἀφῆκεν γυμνὸν τὸν οὐρανόν· ἐγένετο ἐν τῇ μητρὶ καὶ οὐκ ἀφῆκεν τὸν Πατέρα ἄτεκνον.

D

Homélie, linn. 64-65:

Ἦλθεν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀναλαβὼν τὴν ἀνθρωπείαν φύσιν καὶ ὑπ' ἀγγελικῶν δυνάμεων ὑμνεῖται.

Florilège IV, 8-9:

Ἦλθεν ἐπὶ γῆς καὶ τὰς ἀγγελικὰς οὐ κατέλειψεν φαλάγγας.

E

Homélie, lin. 65:

Ὁρᾶται ὡς δοῦλος καὶ κρατεῖ τῶν πάντων ὡς θεός.

Florilège IV, 9-10:

Σπαργανοῦται ἐν φάτνῃ ὡς παιδίον καὶ κρατεῖ πάντα ὡς θεὸς.

F

Homélie, linn. 65-68:

Ἦν οὖν ἐν Πατρί, ἦν ἐν οὐρανῷ, ἦν ἐν Μαρίᾳ, ἦν ἐν σπηλαίῳ, ἦν ἐν φάτνῃ, ἦν ἐν ᾅδῃ, ἦν ἐν κόσμῳ, ἦν ἐν ἀγγέλοις, ἦν παρὰ Χερουβὶμ καὶ Σεραφὶμ καὶ παρὰ πάντων ὁμοῦ τῆς εὐσεβείας τὰ χρέα δεχόμενος.

Florilège IV, 14-17:

Ἦν ἐν Μαρίᾳ καὶ ἦν ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ ὁ αὐτός. Ἦν ἐν Βηθλεέμ, ἦν ἐν οὐρανοῖς. Ἦν ἐν σπηλαίῳ, ἦν ἐπὶ πτερύγων ἀνέμων. Ἦν ἐν θυσιαστηρίῳ, ἦν ἐπὶ τῶν Σεραφίμ. Κάτω ὑπὸ ποιμένων ἐδοξολογεῖτο καὶ ἄνω ὑπὸ τῶν Χερουβὶμ προσεκυνεῖτο.

G

Florilège IV, 18-23: Ἐπειδή usque ad αἰσχύνῃ.

Un seul point de contact, en ces six lignes: il n'est pas impossible que le compilateur se soit souvenu de la ligne 29 de l'homélie: «Il livre son corps à la mort comme un appât à un poisson.»

Homélie, lin. 29:

ὡς δέλεαρ ἰχθύϊ τῷ θανάτῳ προδιδοὺς τὸ σῶμα.

Florilège IV, 20-21:

Τοῦτο γὰρ τὸ σῶμα τῷ θανάτῳ δέλεαρ προέθηκεν.

Première réaction, en découvrant ces parallélismes nombreux, littéraux, enchaînés parfois dans le même ordre: le compilateur du florilège christologique, qui collectionnait les homélies *In natiuitatem*, a jeté son dévolu sur l'homélie, *In natiuitatem Saluatoris* (CPG 5068). Vraisemblablement elle circulait encore sous le nom de Proclus, avant d'être portée ultérieurement, comme beaucoup d'autres, au compte de Chrysostome: il l'aura pillée sans vergogne pour composer sa section IV. Mais, pour avancer cette hypothèse, il faut s'être assuré que notre homélie est antérieure au Florilège, et que ce n'est pas l'homélie, plus tardive, qui se serait inspirée de la section IV du Florilège. Comme je n'avais pas essayé de préciser sa date, en publiant le texte avec Fr.-J. Leroy, il faut résoudre ce problème de chronologie.

III. *L'homélie de Proclus*, In natiuitatem Saluatoris (CPG 5068), *est antérieure au concile d'Éphèse et même probablement antérieure de plusieurs années.*

J'ai montré (*Orpheus* 11, 1990, 88-89) que, en dépit de l'emploi de deux mots savants, ἀτρέπτως et ἀσυνουσιάστως (linn. 8-9) pour préciser le mode de l'Incarnation, Proclus exprime ici son message christologique dans un discours pastoral, d'inspiration biblique. Ainsi distingue-t-il ce qui revient au Sauveur, au même, et dans sa divinité et dans son humanité (*ibid*, pp. 86-87). La rhétorique, avec le balancement de ses antithèses, sert son dessein. Il insiste certes sur la maternité virginale de Marie et use du mot θεοτόκος (linn. 33.38), mais l'usage de ce terme est bien antérieur à Éphèse.[10] On découvre même, dans ce texte, une formule ambiguë qui sera susceptible, plus tard, d'être soupçonnée de dualisme: «s'étant joint lui-même εἰς ἄνθρωπον» (lin. 8). A l'humanité? A l'homme? Cyrille lui aussi a usé deux fois, dans une œuvre de jeunesse, d'une formule analogue, pas encore compromettante.[11] Ces indices invitent à situer notre homélie à une date assez haute dans la carrière de Proclus prédicateur. Elle est certainement antérieure à la promotion de Proclus au siège de Constantinople (434-446). Elle date très probablement des années où, évêque en titre de Cyzique (depuis 426), il prêchait souvent dans la capitale.

Cette hypothèse est confortée par l'évolution manifeste du vocabulaire christologique de Proclus, devenant plus technique à partir de 430. Posons quatre jalons:[12] Dans l'homélie XXIV, *De natiuitate Domini*, du 25 décembre 430, il affirme: «Nous confessons le Christ un en deux natures après l'union (ἕνωσιν) de la divinité et de l'humanité, faite d'une âme et d'un corps, un et le même, fils unique, Seigneur Jésus-Christ. L'union des deux natures en effet aboutit à une filiation et seigneurie unique: union, non confusion (οὐ σύγχυσις); union, non changement (οὐ τροπή); union, non mélange, οὐ φυρμός» (Flor. I, nº 22, 1-7).

Faussant ici compagnie à la chronologie de M. Richard pour nous rallier à celle de Roberto Caro,[13] écoutons Proclus dans son homélie I, *De laudibus Mariae*, en décembre 430, lors d'une fête mariale du cycle de la Nativité, dans la Grande église de Constantinople, face à son archevêque Nestorius. Le texte de cette homélie sera intégré ultérieurement dans les Actes du concile d'Éphèse «Les natures se sont rencontrées (συνῆλθον) et l'union est demeurée sans confusion, ἀσύγχυτος ἔμεινεν ἡ ἕνωσις (PG 65, 689 B; ACO I, 1, 1, p. 107, 4). L'étau se resserre autour de l'archevêque. Proclus est devenu plus précis, plus audacieux dans ses formules; Nestorius répond, dans son homélie XXVII (ACO I, 5, 37-39), avec une modération courtoise.

Avancée plus significative encore, avec l'apparition du mot ὑπόστασις dans le vocabulaire christologique de Proclus, le 1er mars 431—tous sont d'accord sur cette date—dans l'homélie XXIII, *De dogmate Incarnationis*: «Il y a un seul fils, car les natures ne sont pas divisées en deux hypostases (εἰς δύο ὑποστάσεις), mais la redoutable Économie du salut a uni[14] les deux natures en une hypostase unique, εἰς μίαν ὑπόστασιν» (Flor. II, nº 11, 4-7).

Enfin, devenu archevêque de Constantinople, Proclus affirme plus nettement encore, en 435, dans son *Tome aux Arméniens*: «Je confesse qu'une est l'hypostase du Dieu Verbe incarné, τὴν τοῦ σαρκωθέντος Θεοῦ Λόγου ὑπόστασιν» (PG 65, 864 D11; ACO IV, 2, 191, lin. 20).

Manifestement, à partir de 430, le vocabulaire de Proclus s'est précisé, affiné, au sujet de l'union des natures et de l'unité d'hypostase. Quand il a rédigé l'homélie *In natiuitatem Saluatoris*, dont on cherche la date, il n'était pas entré dans la zône des turbulences théologiques. Plusieurs années peut-être avant 430, l'évêque nommé de Cyzique s'exprimait sur un mode pastoral, d'inspiration biblique, avec un faible pour des phrases bien tournées, dans le «style asiate» devenu très à la mode.

On pourrait s'interroger aussi sur la date de compilation du Florilège. Martin n'a pas soufflé mot de ce problème. Posons deux points de repère, dont le premier du moins est indiscutable. Dans la section V du Florilège, le compilateur s'est inspiré de deux homélies de Paul d'Émèse prononcées en Alexandrie, les 25 décembre 432 et 1er janvier 433. Voilà une date butoir. D'autre part, aucune formule trahissant des ajouts ou manipulations de l'auteur ne permet d'affirmer que le Florilège a été composé après le concile de Chalcédoine (451). A titre d'hypothèse, assez vraisemblable, proposons les dernières années de l'épiscopat de Proclus ou les années qui suivirent immédiatement sa mort (446). Rien n'empêche donc qu'il ait exploité, dans sa section IV, l'homélie de Proclus, *In natiuitatem Saluatoris*. Les lieux parallèles assez nombreux, parfois littéraux, souvent enchaînés dans le même ordre, plaident en faveur de ce rapport de dépendance.

IV. *La liberté du compilateur, dans sa manière d'intégrer des matériaux d'emprunt, est manifeste dans les sections III et V du Florilège: la section IV ne fait pas exception.*

Dans la section IV du Florilège, certains traits m'avaient d'abord laissé perplexe. Il paraissait étrange que seulement une dizaine de lignes de l'homélie de Proclus, sur quatre-vingt-cinq, aient été sélectionnées; étrange aussi que le compilateur les aient traitées avec beaucoup de liberté, supprimant ici, ajoutant là, parfois réécrivant le texte à son goût et non sans talent. Or c'est exactement ce qu'a fait le compilateur, dans la section III et surtout dans la section V de son Florilège.

Dans la section III, il travaillait sur l'homélie, *In natalem Christi diem* (PG 56, 385-394. Cf. CPG 4560), homélie attribuée à Jean Chrysostome, mais qui pourrait revenir à Proclus (supra, p. 210). L'auteur du Florilège[15] prélève huit fragments dans l'homélie, soit l'équivalent d'un cinquième seulement du texte: mais, chose plus étonnante, il les dispose selon un ordre différent, dans une composition de son cru: PG 56, 389 linn. 36-50; 388 linn. 31-40; 389 linn. 1-13; 390 lin. 50-391 lin. 1; 391 linn. 35-38; 391, 55-392, 1; 391 linn. 38-41; 392 lin. 8. Le Père Martin a juxtaposé, sur deux colonnes parallèles, les fragments tirés de l'homélie et, en regard, le texte correspondant élaboré par le compilateur. Des caractères «espacés» attirent l'attention sur les mots communs à l'homélie et au Florilège. Si les lieux parallèles sont nombreux, si les emprunts

littéraux prouvent une dépendance flagrante du Florilège relativement à l'homélie, on constate aussi que le compilateur supprime (nº 4), ajoute (nº 6) et réécrit souvent le texte, comme on l'a vu faire dans la section IV.

Liberté plus grande encore du compilateur dans la section V, à l'égard des deux homélies de Paul d'Émèse, *De natiuitate* (PG 77, 1433-1444). Martin[16] a relevé six points de contact entre ces homélies et le Florilège:

1. Allusion à *Is.* 9, 5: «Aujourd'hui, un fils nous est né» (PG 77, 1433A ult. lin., et Flor. V, 1, 1).

2. Commentaire de Matth. 16, 13. 16: «Tu es le Christ, le Fils du Dieu vivant» (1436 D9-10, 1437 A10, et Flor. V, 11, 2-4.

3. Métaphore στόμα appliquée ici à Pierre, στόμα τῶν μαθητῶν, et là à Jean, στόμα τῆς εὐσεβείας (1437 A9, et Flor. V, 4, 3).[17]

4. Éloge de l'Apôtre Jean (1440 C7-10, et Flor, V, 4, 3-5).

5. Exégèse de *Jn* 1, 1: ἦν (1440 D2, et Flor. V, 6, 6).

6. Idem (1440 D3-4, et Flor. V, 6, 7-8).

Ces parallèles, entre les homélies de Paul d'Émèse et la section V du Florilège, sont flagrants. Martin a bien vu que l'auteur du Florilège offre une exégèse très homogène de *Jn* 1, 1: Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ Λόγος, et qu'il s'attache à mettre en relief le caractère divin du Verbe incarné; toutefois, il aurait dû souligner la très forte originalité du compilateur relativement à sa source, originalité qui dépasse de loin les libertés prises dans les sections III et IV. Il pratique ici une exégèse, pourquoi ne pas l'avouer, assez scolaire: il avance mot-à-mot dans le verset de *Jn* 1, 1, pour commenter successivement ἦν (Flor. V, nos 6-7); ἀρχή (V, nos 8-9; divers «commencements» évoqués par l'Écriture); ὁ (V, nos 10-11: valeur de cet article); Λόγος (V, nos 12-13: pourquoi pas υἱός?).

Après ces exemples de «libertés» prises par le compilateur, dans les sections III et surtout V du Florilège, on trouvera bénignes celles prises à l'égard de l'homélie de Proclus, *In natiuitatem Saluatoris*, dans la section IV: malgré quelques suppressions, additions et exercices de réécriture, l'auteur a suivi de près le texte dont il s'inspirait, souvent littéralement. Dans le Florilège, ce traitement de la section IV n'a donc rien d'exceptionnel.

La lecture attentive de la section V m'a suggéré une question nouvelle: l'influence de l'homélie de Proclus, *In natiuitatem Saluatoris*, n'aurait-elle pas débordé la section IV, empiétant sur la section V et l'emportant, en deux passages, sur l'influence de Paul d'Émèse? Cela nous éclairerait

sur les méthodes du mystérieux compilateur de textes christologiques, au milieu du Ve siècle. Cette question, le Père Martin ne pouvait la poser, puisque l'édition princeps de notre homélie de Proclus date de 1989.

V. *Influence de l'homélie de Proclus*, In natiuitatem Saluatoris, *sur la section V du Florilège.*

Tout en étant redevable à Paul d'Émèse de l'inspiration générale et de certaines formules de sa section V, le compilateur a-t-il été influencé, ici encore, par sa lecture de l'homélie de Proclus? Influencé consciemment ou à son insu, peu importe l'explication. Examinons les faits en revenant sur deux lieux parallèles, les nos 5 et 6, signalés par Martin. Élargissons sa comparaison Paul d'Émèse/Florilège, en introduisant Proclus dans la compétition. Confrontons les trois textes:

LIEU PARALLÈLE no 5:

Florilège V, 6, 6: Τοῦ «ἦν» πρεσβύτερον οὐχ εὑρίσκεται.

Paul d'Émèse: τοῦ γὰρ «ἐν ἀρχῇ» οὐδὲν πρεσβύτερον εὑρίσκομεν (PG 77, 1440 D2).

Proclus, linn. 72-73: Τοῦ «ἦν» πρεσβύτερον οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτοῦ (*Orpheus* 10, 1989, 400).[18]

On ne lit pas chez Proclus le verbe εὑρίσκειν utilisé par Paul d'Émèse et par le Florilège, mais en revanche la pointe de la comparaison vise chez lui le verbe ἦν, comme dans le Florilège, et non point ἐν ἀρχῇ comme chez Paul d'Émèse. On notera que le Florilège récidive en faveur de ἦν, ultérieurement, en V, 9, 3-4: ἐπάγει τὸ «ἦν» ἵνα τοῦ «ἦν» πρεσβύτερον μηδὲν νοήσῃ. Pour l'essentiel, le Florilège est donc ici plus proche de Proclus que de Paul d'Émèse.

LIEU PARALLÈLE no 6:

Florilège V, 6, 7-8: Ὅσον ἀνακύψω τῇ διανοίᾳ, κατώτερος εὑρίσκομαι. Τοῦ «ἦν» προτίθησιν «Ἐν ἀρχῇ». «Si haut que je puisse me hisser par la pensée, je me trouve au-dessous. Avant ce 'il était', (l'Écriture) place ce 'Au commencement'».

Paul d'Émèse: κἂν ἀναδράμῃς τῇ διανοίᾳ, προλαμβάνει σε τὸ «ἦν» (1440 D3-4).

Proclus, linn. 73-74: ὅπου ἂν ἀπέλθω τῷ λογισμῷ, τὸ «ἦν» προλαμβάνει με.

Parenté de sens dans les trois formules ὅσον ἀνακύψω / κἂν ἀναδράμῃς

/ ὅπου ἂν ἀπέλθω; accord verbal de Paul d'Émèse et du Florilège (τῇ διανοίᾳ) contre Proclus (τῷ λογισμῷ), mais signification identique chez les trois. En revanche, le Florilège s'éloigne considérablement de la formule de Proclus et de Paul d'Émèse (identique, à un pronom personnel près), pour gloser, assez platement, sur la place des mots dans le verset de *Jn* 1, 1: l'Écriture place en tête, avant «il était», les mots «Au commencement»! Difficile de savoir, ici, qui a influencé le compilateur: Proclus? Paul d'Émèse?

AJOUTONS UN SEPTIÈME LIEU PARALLÈLE, absent de Paul d'Émèse, qui donne l'avantage à Proclus:

Proclus, linn. 69-70: «'Εν ἀρχῇ ἦν »˙« ἀρχὴν» δὲ ἀκούων, ἀγαπητέ, λάμβανε ἀρχὴν ἤτις ἑτέραν οὐχ ὑποδέχεται. «En entendant 'commencement', conçois un commencement qui n'en admet pas un autre.»

Florilège V, 6, 8-10: «'Εν ἀρχῇ ἦν »˙«ἀρχὴν» ἀκούσας, ἀρχὴν μὴ δῷς, ἐπὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν οὐκ ἐᾷς γενέσθαι ἀρχήν. «En entendant 'commencement', n'introduis pas un (autre) commencement, ne laisse pas un (autre) commencement s'ajouter à ce commencement.»

Même formule d'introduction chez Proclus et dans le Florilège. Mais l'argument décisif, qui prouve l'influence exercée, vient d'ailleurs. On a constaté en effet que, pour composer sa section IV, le compilateur a exploité assez littéralement les lignes 59-68 de l'homélie de Proclus. On se doute bien qu'il avait lu aussi la suite immédiate du paragraphe! Pourquoi, même si dans la section V il s'inspire pour l'essentiel de Paul d'Émèse, pourquoi des formules enregistrées dans sa mémoire, qu'il avait lues dans les lignes 69-70 et 72-74 du même paragraphe de Proclus, ne resurgiraient-elles pas ici? Le compilateur ne dresse pas nécessairement des cloisons étanches entre ses sources. S'il en a privilégié une, celle sur laquelle il travaille dans l'instant, il lui arrive aussi d'intégrer des mots et des formules assimilées antérieurement, le cas est ici patent. Cette technique rappelle en quelque sorte ce que, en critique textuelle, on appelle une «contamination», quand un copiste butine des leçons dans divers manuscrits, au grand dam des faiseurs de stemma.

Non seulement notre homélie de Proclus a servi de base au compilateur dans sa section IV, mais elle prolonge son influence dans la section V, inspirée néanmoins, globalement, par Paul d'Émèse. Voilà qui ouvre un aperçu nouveau sur les procédés de l'auteur du Florilège. Les lecteurs futurs, en quête de sources, qui reliront ce Florilège trop peu exploré, devront s'en souvenir.

VI. *Cet article soulève parfois plus de questions qu'il n'en résout. Essayons du moins de dresser un double bilan, au sujet de Proclus et au sujet du Florilège anonyme.*

On a montré que l'homélie, *In natiuitatem Saluatoris* (CPG 5068), récemment éditée, puis restituée à Proclus d'après des arguments de critique interne, a été citée littéralement, linn. 59-74, dans le Florilège d'homélies christologiques des IVe et Ve siècles, transmis par un manuscrit sous le nom de Proclus et publié, en 1941, par Ch. Martin.

Une christologie relativement archaïque suggère d'assigner à cette homélie une date assez haute: donc une œuvre antérieure à l'accession de Proclus au siège de Constantinople (434), antérieure au concile d'Éphèse (431), antérieure même à 430, quand prêchait déjà dans la capitale Proclus, évêque nommé de Cyzique (426). Les jalons chronologiques rappelés dans l'argumentation, pour illustrer la progression technique de son vocabulaire théologique de 430 à 435, pourront servir ultérieurement dans d'autres essais de datation.

La proportion de textes de Proclus dans le Florilège s'est révélée plus importante qu'on ne l'attendait: on y trouve non seulement les homélies XXIV et XXIII (sections I et II) qui ont d'ailleurs trop exclusivement monopolisé l'attention des historiens, du fait qu'on doit à ce Florilège d'en posséder le texte grec «in extenso»; on y trouve encore des extraits de l'homélie, *In natiuitatem Saluatoris* (section IV), et peut-être ceux d'une quatrième homélie de Proclus, le Ps-Chrysostome, *In natalem Christi diem* (CPG 4560), pillée dans la section III, si le plaidoyer de R. Caro étayé par une édition critique (souhaitable) entraînait définitivement l'adhésion. Cette proportion de textes de Proclus expliquerait que le compilateur ait mis l'ensemble au compte de l'archevêque de Constantinople, sans préciser le détail des divers ingrédients.

On a essayé d'assigner une date à ce florilège, ou tout au moins de fixer des points de repère extrêmes, 433 et 451: avant Chalcédoine, dans les dernières années de l'épiscopat de Proclus (446) ou dans celles qui suivirent immédiatement. Les traces laissées par Proclus dans la tradition littéraire indirecte, encore que modestes, s'avèrent ainsi plus précoces qu'on ne l'imagine parfois.

La méthode du mystérieux compilateur a particulièrement retenu l'attention. S'il fait preuve de fidélité dans l'exploitation de ses sources,[19] dans la section IV où il cite littéralement des fragments et, à un degré moindre, dans la section III où il redistribue à sa guise les pièces

du puzzle, il s'attribue une grande liberté pour omettre, ajouter, réécrire (sections III et IV). Sans élever des cloisons étanches entre ses sources, il pratique, sciemment ou à son insu, l'amalgame des emprunts. Ainsi l'influence de l'homélie, *In natiuitatem Saluatoris*, déborde la section IV et se fait sentir jusque dans la section V, en concurrence avec celle de Paul d'Émèse. Le «plus» ajouté aux sources identifiées est-il imputable au talent du compilateur ou devons-nous soupçonner d'autres larcins non encore détectés? Le problème se pose particulièrement dans la section V: tant d'homélies sont encore inédites ou demeurent enfouies dans l'enfer des *Spuria,*[20] que leur christologie tâtonnante et leurs prouesses stylistiques invitent à dater de la première moitié du Ve siècle! Gageons que le Florilège d'homélies christologiques publié par le Père Ch. Martin, il y a un demi siècle, n'a pas encore révélé tous ses secrets.[21]

Notes

[1] *Le Muséon* 54 (1941) 17-57. La citation, faite dans l'introduction, est tirée de la p. 18.

[2] On citera le texte grec du Florilège en renvoyant aux numéros de la section, du paragraphe et de la ligne, ainsi ὑποστάσεις, Flor. II, 11, 5. En revanche, Flor. 33-34 renvoie aux pages du dossier Martin.

[3] L'introduction du mot «hypostase» dans la théologie de l'Incarnation, *MSR* (1945) 261.

[4] *Ibidem* 260, et Martin, Flor. 24-30.

[5] Notes sur deux homélies attribuées à saint Grégoire le Thaumaturge, *RHE* 24 (1928) 369-373, et Flor. 31-33. Citons quelques-unes de ces formules «antiochiennes»: ἔμψυχον ἑαυτῷ κατεκόσμησε (ou κατεσκεύασε) ναόν, ὃν ἐβουλήθη τρόπον πλάσας τὸν ἄνθρωπον (PG 56, 388, 43-45; τὸν ἔμψυχον ἔπλασε ναόν, ou ἄνθρωπον (390, 8-9); τὸν ὑποσκελισθέντα ἔμψυχον ἀνέλαμβανε ναόν (390, 17); ἑαυτῷ ἀφράστως ᾠκοδόμησε ναόν (390, 33). Mais on pourrait citer des formules assez proches chez Proclus.

[6] La homilética mariana griega en el siglo V, *Marian Library Studies* N.S. 4 (Dayton 1972) 374. Caro signale des affinités de pensée et de formules avec Proclus, et même une expression littéralement identique: οὐδὲ κατὰ προκοπὴν ἐξ ἀνθρώπου γέγονε θεός (PG 56, 386, 4) et Proclus, Hom. I: οὐκ ἐκ προκοπῆς γέγονε θεὸς ὁ Χριστός (PG 65, 684 C10). Caro insiste aussi, à juste titre, sur de grandes similitudes de style.

[7] Flor. 33.

[8] *Orpheus* 10 (1989) 400, lin. 54, lire <ἐξ>; lin. 55, lire <τὴν>; linn. 72-73, restituer οὐδέ, leçon du manuscrit, et supprimer la négation οὐκ. Traduire: «et il n'y a pas plus antique que lui.» Une négation simple, succédant à οὐδέ, donnerait à la phrase un sens affirmatif, à l'encontre du sens obvie, manifesté par le parallélisme des deux membres de phrase.

[9] *Orpheus* 11 (1990) 85, lin. 12, lire «conçois»; 90, n. 13, lin. 8, lire «dussé-je»; 100, n. 39, linn. 2-4, lire «cinq manuscrits, très anciens, attribuent l'homélie XIV à Proclus, auquel aucun autre nom n'est opposé par la tradition manuscrite, pas même celui de Chrysostome, souvent envahissant»; p. 102, lin. 10, lire «(pp. 87, 91, 92)».

[10] Cf. R. Laurentin, Les origines du titre de Theotokos, *Court traité sur la Vierge Marie*, 5e éd. (Paris 1967), 170-171.

[11] *Thes. de Trin.* 15 et 21 (PG 75, 281 D, 361 D). Cf. *Orpheus* 11 (1990), 88, n. 6.

[12] Sur la date des textes, 1, 3 et 4, de Proclus, lire Richard, *op. cit.* (n. 3), 256-257, et 260-262.

[13] La homilética mariana griega, *Marian Library Studies* 3 (1971) 79 n. 8, 85, 125. Ce serait anticiper d'un siècle que d'imaginer une fête mariale à Constantinople au 25 mars, dans laquelle Proclus aurait prononcé son homélie I, *De laudibus Mariae*. Cette hypothèse sans fondement repose sur un présupposé «théologique» (exigence, neuf mois avant la fête de la Nativité de Jésus, d'une fête correspondante en l'honneur de sa mère). De plus, on a vu une allusion au printemps dans une phrase, bien vague, de l'exorde de Proclus (PG 65, 681 A1-2: «Voici que terre et mer font une garde d'honneur à la Vierge; la mer en étendant avec calme son dos sous les vaisseaux, la terre en dirigeant sans obstacle les pas des voyageurs» (Festugière). Même si on a trop souvent annexé des homélies mariales de date incertaine à une fête, dite «Mémoire de la Théotokos», dans le cycle de la Nativité (cf. mes critiques contre cette inflation, *Homélies festales d'Hésychius de Jérusalem*, Bruxelles 1978, 132-134), l'hypothèse serait plus fondée à Constantinople, dans la mouvance de Noël 430; d'autant que Fr.-J. Leroy a découvert une version latine ancienne et une version éthiopienne de cette homélie, qui mentionnent dans son titre: «In natale», ou «in festo natiuitatis» (*L'homélie de Proclus*, Rome 1967, 157, 66, 65, 61). L'argumentation de Richard, tirée de l'évolution des relations Nestorius/ Proclus, vaut aussi bien en faveur de la fin décembre 430 qu'en faveur du 25 mars 431. Quant à notre enquête sur la progression technique du vocabulaire christologique de Proclus, elle n'est en rien modifiée par ce décalage de trois mois, affectant l'homélie I de Proclus.

[14] J'adopte la leçon de la *Doctrina Patrum*, ἑνωσάσης, préférable à ἑνώσας.

[15] Cf. Martin, Florilège, 30-33.

[16] *Ibidem*, 36-37.

[17] On pourrait invoquer la même métaphore, employée par Proclus, *In natiuitatem Saluatoris*, lin. 56: «Pierre, bouche du Saint-Esprit», mais ces rapprochements basés uniquement sur le mot στόμα, sans tenir compte du déterminatif, sont trop vagues pour être pris en compte.

[18] Les exemples cités, du Florilège et de Paul d'Émèse, justifient rétrospectivement ma conjecture, lin. 72: correction de τό, leçon du manuscrit, en τοῦ. Sur ce thème général, πρεσβύτερον, cf. *Orpheus* 10 (1989), 402-403, n. 17-18; 11 (1990), 85-86, n. 3-4, et *Homélies Pascales inédites*, SC 187 (Paris 1972), 246-248, n. 50, et 249, n. 53.

[19] Dans les sections I (homélie XXIV de Proclus) et II (homélie XXIII), la doublure des versions orientales garantit la fidélité globale du texte grec transmis par le Florilège. Du moins rien n'approche, dans les quelques libertés prises, ce que l'on constate dans la suite du Florilège, et surtout dans la section V. La section II trahit tout de même deux éditions grecques de l'homélie XXIII, *De dogmate Incarnationis*: l'une, la plus ancienne, destinée à une prédication de début du Carême, l'autre qui aurait été légèrement remaniée pour la fête de Noël. Ch. Martin a relevé une dizaine de modifications «en plus» ou «en moins» (Flor., 27-28). Il suggère que cette transformation serait l'œuvre non de Proclus, mais du compilateur; celui-ci aurait «harmonisé» l'homélie avec le thème général de son recueil (Flor., 30). Cette hypothèse apporterait de l'eau à mon moulin! N'étant pas tout à fait convaincu, j'ai préféré ne pas tirer argument de cette manipulation, au demeurant bénigne

(une dizaine de retouches, dans un long texte, reproduit «in extenso»), en comparaison des transformations décelées dans les sections suivantes.

[20] On me permettra de signaler une récente restitution à Proclus, dans ma contribution: Ps-Chrysostome, *In S. Stephanum* (PG 63, 933-934). Proclus de Constantinople, l'impératrice Pulchérie et saint Étienne, *Fructus Centesimus. Mélanges offerts à Gerard J.M. Bartelink*, Instrumenta Patristica XIX (1989), 1-16.

[21] Pour compléter ces recherches autour de Proclus, voir un dossier sur la tradition manuscrite de son homélie XIV, *In Pascha*, et sur ses emprunts à un Ps.-Chrys. «inspiré d'Hippolyte» (SC 27, Paris 1950, Nautin), dans mon article, Un recueil de textes «chrysostomiens», notamment d'homélies pascales: le codex Pharmakidi 22 (s. XVI), ΜΕΣΑΙΩΝΙΚΑ ΚΑΙ ΝΕΑ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΑ 3 (1990), 387-395.

F 75 007 *Paris*, 42 rue de Grenelle MICHEL AUBINEAU

Vigiliae Christianae 45 (1991), 223-241, E. J. Brill, Leiden

LITERARY HISTORY AND GENERIC EXPECTATIONS IN THE *PASSIO* AND *ACTA PERPETUAE*

BY

J. W. HALPORN

Literary historians who work with texts from ancient Greece and Rome, what is generally known as classical literature, tend to consider the genesis of texts and generic identification as central to the study. This "investigation of the genesis of literary phenomena" (Tynianov, 121) leads to regarding as primary in the study of texts not the literary text itself, but its origin. It privileges such questions as manuscript tradition, authorship, date and place of production, sources, and the place of the text within the social and political history of its time of production.[1] The historian of ancient literature, having privileged literature that fits into the classical canon, is at a loss faced with texts that do not exhibit those qualities. In particular, the literary historian finds it difficult, if not impossible, to evaluate and judge texts that are not "uniform" and, in some sense, "unified and protected."[2]

This problem in literary history reflects the situation in text criticism where an "open" tradition causes the critic serious problems of evaluation and judgment. There is a supposition that for every text there exists a real (not a hypothesized) archetype to which all the extant evidence refers and from which it, in the last analysis, flows. Attempting to edit a text which does not exhibit this kind of unity or uniformity creates methodological and practical problems for the text critic. The so-called "wild" texts of Homer that appear in many of the papyri from Greco-Roman Egypt represent a case in point. In a real sense, there is no *text*, but rather a series of texts, superimposed and interconnected.

For the literary critic as well there is the problem of genre. As has often been noted in recent years, genres set up certain "horizons of expectations," and a text that does not conform to these expectations can be a source of unease to the critic. The lack of ease of both Augustine and Jerome when faced with the Latinity of Biblical texts is well known. For the modern critic the same problems arise with the lives

and passions of the saints, since these texts do not belong to any of the established and canonical genres. And when dealing with two widely differing versions of the same narrative, as we have in the *Passio* and *Acta* of Perpetua and Felicity, they almost automatically treat these texts in ways that do not do them justice.[3]

Since the *Passio* is one of the earliest saints' lives, it has been the subject of intense scrutiny over the years. All of these studies have made the following assumptions, which have continued to serve as axioms for all scholars. I am not trying to argue that these axioms are false, only that they are, as axioms, assumptions made without proof, and that they are not necessarily or ipso facto true. The first is that the *Acta* and the *Passio* are historical documents. The second is the assumption that the first-person narratives contained within the *Passio* are, to use the term generally applied, the "diary" or "account" written by Perpetua in prison and the "diary" written by the deacon Saturus, another of the prisoners. These narratives are regarded as the ipsissima verba of the two martyrs.[4] These assumptions have informed all discussions of these texts, and such analyses have offered us many valuable insights for our understanding of them.

Philologists have asked questions about the languages of the texts: the relationship of the Greek to the Latin and the dates of each of these renderings; about the linguistic registers (Vulgar Latin, Classical Latin, Koine Greek); about the stylistic registers (Franchi de' Cavalieri, Auerbach). They have studied the relations of the texts, the *Passio* and the *Acta* (e.g., abridgement or enlargement; the dates of each version). There is also the question of the "authorship" of the text, which has at various times been ascribed to the third-century North African Church Father, Tertullian.[5] Historians have treated the texts as social history, discussing what they tell us about gladiatorial contests and festivals in the North African city of Carthage (Robert), about domestic relations between fathers, daughters, sisters, children, slaves, and masters (Mayeski, Rossi). They have studied the mentalités: Christian and pagan, the belief in and use of visions, the belief in the intercessory powers of the martyrs (Amat, Saxer). Feminist scholars have examined the relationship of Perpetua to her fellow prisoners, to her living and dead brothers, and especially to her pagan father (Lefkowitz, Wilson-Kastner). Others have examined the psychology of the visions of Perpetua and Saturus, and considered the meaning of the desire for martyrdom (Amat, Dodds, Lods). Political historians have focussed on

persecution under the Severan emperors, and the exact date of the martyrdom (Barnes). Religious historians have looked at the relation of these texts to the development in North Africa of the Montanist movement (Labriolle, Klawiter). But I wish to look at these texts in a different way.

In the early part of the year 203 of our era, a group of young Christians in Carthage was arrested, imprisoned, tried, and condemned to the beasts by the Roman authorities.[6] They suffered martyrdom on 7 March, as part of the festivities celebrating the birthday of the Caesar, Geta, the son of the reigning emperor, Septimius Severus.[7] The story of these events has come down to us in two versions and in two languages. The longer text, known generally since the edition of van Beek as the *Passio Sanctarum Perpetuae et Felicitatis*, and the shorter text, which van Beek has called the *Acta SS Perpetuae et Felicitatis*. The *Passio* is extant is both Latin and Greek, and the relationship of these has been, and continues to be, a subject of much controversy. The *Acta*, extant only in Latin, have come down to us in two distinct but related forms.[8] It will therefore be helpful in orienting ourselves to this text to outline its structure. The *Passio* does not present a uniform text of single authorship, but reveals three distinct divisions in the form of embedded narratives:[9]

The Frame:

1. Chapters 1, 2, 14-21 (as well as 11.1 and 14.1). An anonymous figure, often known as the redactor (since this personage also "edited" the texts of Perpetua and Saturus, 2 and 3 below)[10] frames the story of the martyrdom by directing the reader to the edifying value of the stories of the martyrs and the unceasing operations of the Holy Spirit (1); the same personage continues in the following chapter to tell of the arrest of five North African catechumens along with their teacher. After a brief description of Perpetua's social class, status, and family, the redactor reports her age as being 21, and says that she herself narrated the entire story of her martyrdom in her own hand and in her own words (2.3). In the closing chapters of the *Passio* (14-21) the redactor relates what took place in the amphitheatre and the prison, in accordance with Perpetua's wish that someone write up the events at the games (10.15: *ipsius autem muneris actum, si quis voluerit, scribat*). The redactor also tells the story of Felicity, the other woman who was martyred. This text

closes with a brief epilogue that echoes, as in a ring-composition, the opening words (21.11).

Thus, the narration of the events surrounding the martyrdom is embedded in a narrative directing the reader to regard this entire text as a new example of the kinds of texts that scripture offered them and especially to mark how the Holy Spirit continues to work in the contemporary world. The particular effect of these operations of the Holy Spirit is the continuation of prophecy and visions. As a proof text, there is offered an Old Latin version of Acts 2:17f.: "In novissimis diebus, dicit Dominus, effundam de Spiritu meo super omnem carnem, et prophetabunt filii filiaeque eorum; et super servos et ancillas meas de meo Spiritu effundam; et iuvenes visiones videbunt, et senes somnia somniabunt" ("In the last days, saith the Lord, I will pour forth of My Spirit on all flesh, and their sons and their daughters shall prophesy; and on my servants and on my handmaids I will pour forth of my Spirit; and the young men shall see visions, and the old men shall dream dreams") (1.4). In telling of the events of the games themselves, the redactor specifically notes that in this way by the will of the Holy Spirit both the testamentary injunction (*mandatum*) and the testamentary request (*fideicommissum*) of Perpetua are fulfilled (16.1).

The embedded narrative of Perpetua:

2. Chapters 3-10. Perpetua's own words *manu sua et suo sensu*, according to the redactor (2.3), describe the events before her arrest, the efforts of her father who urges her to abjure her new faith, and the vision she had while she was in prison. She concludes her narrative on the day before the games in which she is to be martyred.

The embedded narrative of Saturus:

3. The redactor tells us (11.1 and 14.1) that chapters 11-13 report the vision of Saturus as it was written by Saturus himself (*visionem suam edidit, quam ipse conscripsit*).

The *Acta* present a completely different text,[11] and are not to be regarded as merely a later and inferior reworking of the *Passio*.[12] The two versions of the *Acta* agree in general, but often differ not only in their wording but in their argument. Text *B* abbreviates what *A* tells

both more extensively and in a different way. But *A* also abbreviates sections that appear more fully in *B*. The relationship between the two texts is unclear. Van Beek notes that *B*, since it is shorter, can seem (at first sight) to be the older. He, however, conjectures that the writer of *B* epitomized text *A* in the same manner and with the same carelessness as the *Acta* abbreviated the *Passio*.[13] Neither of these assumptions is necessarily true. All that can be stated with certainty is that the text of *A* has come down to us in more MSS.[14] The following discussion will focus on both texts. Since the *Acta* are much less well-known than the *Passio* I have given a full summary of their content, assuming that a wider familiarity with the *Passio* precludes such a need.

The *Acta* begin abruptly with a brief background of the events, and proceed almost at once to reporting the words of a judicial proceeding. In a persecution which takes place in the consulships of Valerian and Gallienus [mid 3rd century] a group of Christians was arrested in the city of Thurburdo Minus by the proconsul of Africa, Minucius: Saturus and Saturninus (described as brothers in *A* only), Revocatus and his sister Felicity, and Perpetua, a woman of high social class having a father, mother, two brothers and an infant male child (in *B* she is simply described as the daughter of a socially respectable father and already a Christian as are all the others arrested). The texts continue with much the sort of legalistic language found already in the *Acts of the Scillitan Martyrs*.[15]

Omissions, expansions, and shifts in point of view in the two versions of the *Acta* alter the tone and focus of each significantly. The interrogation is interrupted by a dialogue between Perpetua and her father. Version *A* (2.2) offers the comparison of the Latin term (*nomen*) for a vase and the name of Christian. Version *B* has Perpetua deliver a pun on her name.[16] Her father attacks her, but ceases in Version *B* "conturbatus divino terrore" (2.3). There is no mention of the infant child.

Both versions then turn to Perpetua's first vision. It should be noted that the description of the vision is not preceded by a discussion between Perpetua and her "brother,"[17] nor is she asked to demand a vision to determine their future. In *A* the vision is told in the first person but in the perfect tense with continued repetition of the word *vidi*; in *B* it is told in the third person and in the imperfect tense. The ladder and the snake are briefly described, and Saturus already at the top of the ladder looks down, and addresses her in the second person plural (a form of polite address?); he does not warn her of the snake, but she neither

climbs the ladder nor steps on the snake's head. Although Saturus encourages her to climb up, she arrives at the garden next to (*iuxta*) the ladder (the tense in *B* now changes to perfect), sees an old man dressed as a shepherd surrounded by a group all dressed in white who calls them over (note the plural *nos*) and without addressing them, gives them a milk product (*A*: *de fructu lactis*; *B*: *de fructibus gregis*).[18] There is no ceremony, but as they taste (*gustassemus*), those in white robes shout "Amen," and Perpetua awakens. She repeats the vision to the others and they learn from her revelation (*A*) or vision (*B*) that they will receive the *corona martyrii*. There is no mention of the suffering to come or that they are to give up any hope in this world as in the *Passio*.

The interrogatory takes up again as Minucius questions the prisoners one by one, separating the men from the women. After the men have remained steadfast in their refusal to make sacrifice, the women are brought before the proconsul. He first addresses Felicity, who in *B* makes the same kind of simple reply as the men have already offered. The interchange in *A* is more extensive. The proconsul asks Felicity if she has a husband. She replies "Habeo quem nunc contemno," and, on further questioning, states that he is not present. She also notes that he is a plebeian, and that she has no parents. Indeed her only relative is her brother, except for the other prisoners, who are her real family. The proconsul observes that she is pregnant, and Felicity replies by saying that she is a Christian and has been taught to reject everything except God. This exchange is missing in *B*; when she gives her name the proconsul simply replies that she will lose all the joy of this life, but Felicity says she hopes to attain eternal life through temporal punishments.[19]

The proconsul then turns to Perpetua, and asks her to sacrifice. Again, Perpetua plays on her name (the wording differs slightly in *A* and *B*). In *A* the proconsul asks her if she has parents, and she assents. In *B* the parents simply arrive, together with her brothers and her husband who brings their infant son. *A* adds that they were part of the audience since they were of high social class. In *A* her father falls before her and appeals to her. He refers to his old age, asks her to have pity on him and her mother, brothers, and her unhappy husband standing there as well as the infant who cannot live without her. Indeed, the shame she brings on her family will destroy them all. *B* omits the confrontation and only refers to her parents and the everlasting shame she will bring on them.

Perpetua remains unmoved. In *A* she addresses her father with yet

another play on her name.[20] In *B*, Perpetua tells them that she does not recognize her pagan parents, who, if they were Christians, would support her resolve. The proconsul in *A* urges her to heed the tears of her parents and her child. She replies that were it not for the sight of God and her companions she would be moved. In *B*, the proconsul himself is moved by the parents' tears, and urges her to be moved also; she does not reply.

Her father throws (*iactans*) her child on her neck, and her mother and husband beg her to live with them (thus *A*; *B* mentions only that her father is holding her child and asking her to have mercy on her parents). Perpetua forcibly rejects the child (*proiciens infantem*) and drives her parents off, calling them workers of iniquity, and regarding them as foreign to her who now belongs to Christ and God. The proconsul condemns them all to be beaten, jailed, and handed over to the beasts.

While in prison, Perpetua has a second vision. She sees the Egyptian rolling on the ground beneath their feet. The martyrs hearing of her vision, rejoice that the devil ("inimicus humani generis") is overcome and they shall be worthy of martyrdom. They are sad because Felicity is in her eighth month, and therefore pray for her. In the midst of her prayers she gives birth (note that no mention is made in either version that pregnant women cannot be executed). In *A* the guards ask her how she will manage in the amphitheatre, since she suffered so much in childbirth. She replies that here she is suffering, there the Lord will suffer for her. Neither the onlookers' comment nor her reply appear in *B*.

On the day of Caesar's birthday (the Caesar is not named) the prisoners are brought into the amphitheatre. Felicity comes, in the words of *A*, from the blood of the flesh to the blood of salvation, from the midwife to the sword, and from washing in the bath after giving birth to earn the washing of blood. *B* presents Felicity as one who did not seek a midwife because of her love for martyrdom and her desire of Christ, and who did not feel the pain of childbirth. About to gain the crown of martyrdom after the burden of her womb, she is an example not only to women but also to men.

The martyrs are placed nude with their arms tied behind them in the middle of the amphitheatre. In *A*, various animals are set on them, and Saturus and Perpetua are devoured by lions. *B* is much more florid here: the martyrs eager for the delights of paradise are attacked by starved lions which hastens their martyrdom. According to *A*, Saturninus is

torn by bears and killed with a sword (the sword is lacking in *B*); Revocatus and Felicity are torn apart by leopards.

A short epilogue in each version summarizes the date and place of the martyrdom. In *A* the faithful are urged to read these events in church, to share in their memory, and to ask that God by their prayers and those of all the saints have mercy on them, closing with a brief doxology to God alone. In *B* the Church is urged to keep in memory these events, to recall the martyrs' triumph and the aid of the Lord, and to be uplifted in spirit by the strength of both sexes, even when persecution is not taking place. It closes with a brief doxology to the Lord.

What is most striking here is not the differences in content of the two documents as such, but the entirely different intent and focus of the *Acta* and the *Passio*. Only by considering the differing intentions can we appreciate why, say, the vision of Dinocrates is missing from the *Acta* as well as the vision granted to Saturus, and why there is so much greater emphasis on Felicity in the *Acta* than in the *Passio*.

The *Acta* seem to be a series of confrontations with the authorities, with parents, with the crowd, leading to quick deaths in the amphitheatre in exposure to wild animals. The report of the events was to serve the community as an edifying example of the rejection of worldly ties for the sake of the community of Christians. The *Passio*, however, seems to be a series of stories and visions tied to the idea of martyrdom as a glorious set of trials, followed in each case by a triumph. As such, both versions do belong to a wider tradition of biographical narrative (cf. Aune, 107-126), combined with stories of visions. The *Passio* has certain affinities with works like Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* in which there is considerable confusion in the readers' mind between the narrator, Apuleius, and the character, Lucius. The *Metamorphoses*, too, contains embedded narratives, and already in antiquity, we know that readers wondered about the veracity of the travails of Lucius/Apuleius.[21] What we are seeing here is the emergence of a new genre by the "transformation of one or several earlier genres."[22]

Rather than seek once more to determine the relationship of these versions, and to determine their relative value (which most often leads to a denigration of the *Acta*) I wish to consider how these texts *function*. It is clear that texts like these are not to be evaluated in the same terms as standard literary texts. As Delehaye (173) remarks, "L'état

d'instabilité des textes, est en hagiographie, une sorte de loi du genre...."[23]

To understand these differences, we need first to look at another text, one that is far distant from these versions of martyrdom both in content and in time. Indeed, they seem to have nothing whatsoever to do with one another. The story concerns the character George Barnwell who was influenced by a wicked woman to murder his uncle for his money. The literary vicissitudes of the story present a useful parallel to the *Passio* and the *Acta*. The broadside ballad "George Barnwel" was composed between 1594-1624. In the next 130 years the ballad underwent several generic transformations from prose biography to bourgeois tragedy.[24] Around 1700 the ballad was published with a brief prose biography of George Barnwell, under the title of *The Prentice's Tragedy: or The History of George Barnwell.* The ballad, a first person narrative, was thus turned into a third person narrative, a "History of a Brief Life." Such lives begin with birth and origin, and can be regarded as a supplement to the ballad, offering additional biographical details. This short fiction identifies the parents of "Barnwell" and explains his sudden change as due to his reading of romances (instead of the Bible). As a result, the biography changes the ballad, removing some of the plot elements and making other supplements. As Ralph Cohen also notes, this prose version intended for printing removes elements that belong to verse and to oral presentation. In doing so, the biography creates a "generic shift," by turning the character of the ballad into an individual with a real history.

The tragedy of 1731, *The London Merchant* by George Lillo, imposes its own generic considerations on the material. The characters had to be made "worthy" of this genre, and they thus become characters involved in the affairs of society. The choice of genres here is made on the basis of new ideologies. All of the versions of the tale are for the edification of young men, but in each case the text is in a real sense rewritten.[25]

The same kinds of generic transformations have occurred in the several accounts of the martyrdom of Perpetua and Felicity. If we turn then to the *Passio*, we find the story of the martyrdom is based on the protocols of the trial, the description of the visions of Perpetua and Saturus, and the reports of the eye-witnesses to events in the tribunal, in the prison, and in the arena. These narratives are, in Cohen's terms, non-literary texts. Yet they possess many qualities of literary texts. They are presented to us within the framework constructed by the redactor

that leads the reader, by its style, towards edification. Indeed, the preface invites us to consider and read the *Passio* in a particular way. Were it not for this preface, we probably would not have considered the question of the Montanist views of the visions.[26]

Let us then look at what this preface "does," and how it affects our "horizon of expectations" of the embedded narratives. Jacques Fontaine (73) has noted of the preface that it was written for the community and within it, by an author (whom he calls semi-literate) who boldly claims that the work has a continuity with that of the sacred writings of the Bible. At the beginning the author states that the "new evidences" (*nova documenta*) should be collected just as the "ancient examples of the faith" (*vetera fidei exempla*) had been. And just as the scriptural examples bear witness of the grace of God and work for edification of mankind, so these new evidences will in the future have the same force for posterity. This work will have an exemplary function.

Furthermore, the author sees in the abundance of grace (*exuperationem gratiae*) a rebirth of inspiration in these last times, the end of this world which, the author feels, is now at hand. The proof text for this is an Old Latin version of Acts 2:17f., itself a reworking of Joel 2:38. No proof text could more suitably indicate how the author places the passion: from Old Testament to New Testament the tradition of visions in the last days has come to the Carthaginian Christians.

This outpouring of the Holy Spirit in the last days is compared to the prophecies of old and new visions which had been promised and are now received and honored. We might expect this statement to be followed immediately by the proof text of I John 1-3, but a lengthy and rhetorically clumsy intercalation separates the proof texts.[27] We, the speaker says, assign the rest of the powers (*virtutes*) of the Holy Spirit to the teaching (*instrumentum*) of the Church. The following relative clause "[Ecclesia] cui missus est idem omnia donativa administraturus in omnibus, prout unicuique distribuit Dominus" ("[the Church] to which the same Holy Spirit was sent to distribute all [the free] gifts [of God] among all men, just as the Lord has distributed to each one") involves a whole set of reminiscences from the Pauline epistles, ranging from Romans to I Corinthians and Hebrews,[28] all emphasizing the divine distribution of spiritual gifts.[29]

To close off the proemium, the author expands the Old Latin version of I John 1-3: *quod audivimus et contrectavimus, annuntiamus et vobis*, fratres et filioli, *uti et vos* qui interfuistis rememoremini gloriae Domini,

et qui nunc cognoscitis per auditum *communionem habeatis cum* sanctis martyribus. The change from *communio* (Vulg *societas*) *nobiscum* of I John to *cum sanctis martyribus* reflects the tendentious attitude of the author and this preface, who ties the audience to fellowship with the holy martyrs and not with the entire community and church. This recasting of the text followed immediately by a doxology not only emphasizes the prophetic and apocalyptic character of what will follow but places its squarely within the framework of liturgy. The power of classical oratory unites with the kerygmatic eloquence of the Bible to create a public profession of a religious faith (Fontaine, 84).

Yet the narratives that follow this preface both relate to it and oppose it. Perpetua's visions reflect a shift from the pompous "We-style" of the oratorical preface to the "I-style" which is best known in antiquity in prose from the novel and romance. In spite of the clear emphasis in the visions on Biblical reminiscence and Biblical style, we are far removed from the complex rhetoric of the preface and the involved allegories of works like the *Shepherd of Hermas*. Thus there is a dissonance between the claims of the preface that we are reading a text within the tradition of Old and New Testament scripture and the simpler first person narrative that follows.

But the author of the preface, if this is the same person as the redactor, has also recast the traditional materials to create a unity that will hold our attention on specific features of Perpetua and her dreams. Although the *Passio* has come down to us with the names of both Perpetua and Felicity, the section of the *Passio* taken from the proconsular protocols focusses on Perpetua alone, and even more importantly on her confrontation not only with the officials but with her father. The only other individual of concern to her is her child, but when her father refuses to return her child to her after the second hearing, she disregards the child. A few days later, she has the first vision of her deceased brother Dinocrates whom she sees in a kind of purgatory (Ciccarese, 35-38). She prays for him day and night and has a second vision in which he is saved. In her first vision she confronts the Good Shepherd who is portrayed as an old man; in her last vision a gigantic male figure appears as the presiding official. Felicity's place in the narrative is small. She appears briefly when she gives birth, and again in the arena together with Perpetua to meet the fierce cow. Here the feminine qualities of Perpetua are emphasized. When struck down by the beast, she covers her limbs with her torn garment, "more conscious of propriety than of

pain'' (*pudoris potius memor quam doloris*, 20.4). Then she demands a pin so that she can tie up her hair and not look like a woman in mourning. Her last words are reminiscences of several passages from the New Testament (I Cor 16:13, I John 4:7, and Mark 14:27). She dies by the sword, as she must, according to her first vision, but since she must in a sense will her own death, she directs the shaking hand of the novice gladiator to her throat. As she is the heroine of the beginning of the narrative, so she is also the heroine of the end. The combination of late classical and Judeo-Christian elements in the *Passio* are unmistakable.

Critics have for the most part rejected the *Acta* as historically valueless, in large part, as one reads their arguments, because of their poor literary quality. From my standpoint, both the *Acta* and the *Passio* are historical documents, in that their significance derives from the actual events to which they testify. But they are not documents whose historicity as such is central. Their intention is to present something other than a report of the historical event, as, say, the proconsular protocols do. This is in no way to suggest that the major events reported in the *Acta* and *Passio* did not occur in a time and a place, namely the arrest, trial, and execution of the martyrs in North Africa early in the third century A.D. The lives are unlike history in that they are not a kind of research or inquiry, proceeding by the interpretation of the evidence, that is, of documents. As narratives, one is not better than the other, because in that sense they are not comparable. They have different intentions and to attempt to compare them would be to indulge, as the cliché puts it, in the comparison of apples and oranges.

When Jacobus de Voragine wrote the life of Perpetua for the Golden Legend, he knew the version of the *Passio* as well of the *Acta*.[30] Why did he choose to make use of the latter version? If we consider this question seriously, we can gain some insight into how the acts of the saints differ from their passions.

The *Acta* focus on all the martyrs: each gets a chance to appear before the court and say his or her piece. The saintliness of Perpetua and Felicity is emphasized by their crude gestures of refusal of husband, child, family, with their eyes always turned to heaven. The individual women reject their past lives without qualm. Perpetua's high social status is mentioned several times, and Felicity's lower status noted.[31] Some gaps in the passion story are filled in and sometimes further emphasized. The filler is the family background, and Perpetua's report of her visions to the martyrs as referring to all of them. Consider the

version of her battle with the Egyptian in the *Acta*: it is a momentary and almost impersonal vision in which it is not she who sets her foot on the adversary, but all of her companions who do so. Something similar occurs in the treatment of her vision of the heavenly ladder. In the *Passio* she reports it to her "brother" (see fn. 17, above) and explains that it refers to both of them: they believed it meant that they would suffer and from that point on they no longer put any hope in this life.[32] In the *Acta* the report of the vision is made to the martyrs, who themselves interpret it to mean that they will all gain the crown of martyrdom.[33] Since the two visions involving her brother Dinocrates are personal to Perpetua, they are naturally omitted from the *Acta* which deals with the community of martyrs.[34] Furthermore, the rhetorical language of the *Acta* is intended to create effects pleasing to an audience accustomed to Late Latin eloquence. These *Acta* are much closer in style to the sermons of Augustine than is the *Passio*.

No one can doubt that the literary quality of the *Acta* is far inferior to that of the *Passio*. Yet this literary superiority should not be used to assess the historical accuracy of the texts. To search for specific and certain historical facts in these texts without supporting external evidence is at the least a poor methodology for historical research.[35] Nor is the story told by the *Passio* necessarily "truer" than that offered by the *Acta*. To suggest that this is the case is to privilege one literary text merely because of its "literariness." Each text does something different to the audience to which it is directed. In each case, the "horizon of expectation" of each audience is satisfied.[36]

If I can end with an example. The paintings of Jesus Christ that can be found in many religious stores and churches in the United States are hardly art in the sense of a Rembrandt on the same subject. But they speak to their audiences in ways the Rembrandt paintings do not. This does not make such hack work into important and fine art; the message they deliver to their audience is still worth considering and discussing.

WORKS CITED

Amat, J. "L'authenticité des songes de la Passio de Perpétue..." *Augustinianum* 29 (1989): 177-91.

——, *Songes et visions. L'au-delà dans la littérature latine tardive.* Paris: Etudes Augustiniennes, 1985.

Auerbach, Eric. *Literary Language and its Public in Late Latin Antiquity and in the Middle Ages.* Trans. R. Mannheim. New York: Pantheon, 1965 (Bollingen 74).

Aune, David E. "Greco-Roman Biography." *Greco-Roman Literature and the New Testament: Selected Forms and Genres.* Ed. D. E. Aune. Atlanta: Scholars P, 1988.

Barnes, T. "Pre-Decian Acta Martyrum." *JThS* NS 19 (1968): 509-531.

——. *Tertullian: A Historical and Literary Study.* Oxford: Clarendon P, 1971.

Ciccarese, M. P. "Le più antiche rappresentazioni del purgatorio dalla Passio Perpetuae alla fine del IX secolo." *Romanobarbarica* 7 (1984): 33-76.

Cohen, R. "History and Genre." *New Literary History* 17 (1986): 203-218; cf. D. LaCapra, "Comment." Ibid., 219-221; R. H. Brown, "Toward a Sociology of Aesthetic Forms—A Commentary." Ibid., 223-228; R. Cohen, "Reply to Dominick LaCapra and Richard Harvey Brown." Ibid., 229-232.

——. "Literary History and the Ballad of George Barnwell." *Augustan Studies. Essays in Honor of Irvin Ehrenpreis.* Ed. D. L. Patey and T. Keegan. Newark, DE: U of Delaware P, 1985. 13-31.

Delehaye, H. *Les Passions des martyrs et les genres littéraires.* Brussels, 1921 (Subsidia Hagiographica 13B).

Dodds, E. R. *Pagan and Christian in an Age of Anxiety.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1965.

Dronke, P. *Women Writers of the Middle Ages: A Critical Study of Texts from Perpetua (d. 203) to Marguerite Porete (d. 1310).* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1984.

Finley, M. I. *Ancient History: Evidence and Models.* New York: Penguin, 1987.

Fontaine, J. "Tendances et difficultés d'une prose chrétienne naissante: l'esthétique composite de la *Passio Perpetuae.*" *Aspects et problèmes de la prose d'art latine au IIIe siècle. La Genèse des styles latins chrétiens.* Turin: Bottega d'Erasmo, 1968. 69-97.

Franchi de'Cavalieri, P., ed. "La Passio Perpetuae et Felicitatis latine et graece." *Studi Agiografici* I (Vatican City 1962): 41-156. (= Studi e Testi 221).

Fridh, A. *Le Problème de la Passion des saintes Perpétue et Félicité.* Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia 26. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1968.

Klawiter, F. C. "The Role of Martyrdom and Persecution in Developing the Priestly Authority of Women in Early Christianity: A Case Study of Montanism." *Church History* 49 (1980): 251-261.

Labriolle, P. de. *La Crise Montaniste.* Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1913.

Leclercq, H. "Perpétue et Félicité." *DACL* 14.1 (Paris 1939) 393-444.

Lefkowitz, M. "The Motivations for St. Perpetua's Martyrdom." *Heroines and Hysterics.* New York: St. Martin's P, 1981. 52-58 (= *J AmAcad Rel* 44 [1976]: 417-421).

Lods, M. *Confesseurs et martyrs successeurs des prophètes dans l'église des trois premiers siècles.* Neuchatel-Paris, 1958.

Mayeski, M. A. *Women: Models of Liberation.* Kansas City, MO: Sheed & Ward, 1988.

Monceaux, P. *Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne.* I. *Tertullien et les origines.* Bruxelles: Culture et Civilisation, 1966 (rp. of Paris, 1901).

Robert, L. "Une Vision de Perpétue martyre à Carthage en 203." *CRAIBL* 1982, 228-276.

Robinson, J. Armitage, ed. *The Passion of S. Perpetua.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1891 (= Texts and Studies 1.2).

Rossi, M. A. "The Passion of Perpetua, Everywoman of Late Antiquity." *Pagan and Christian Anxiety: A Response to E. R. Dodds.* Ed. R. C. Smith and J. Lounibosa. Lanham, MD: University P of America, 1984. 53-86.

Saxer, V. *Morts, martyrs, reliques en Afrique du Nord aux premiers siècles. Les témoinages de Tertullien, Cyprien, Augustin, à la lumière de l'archéologie africaine.* Paris: Editions Beauchesne, 1980.

Schlunk, H. "Zu den frühchristlichen Sarkophagen aus der Bureba (Prov. Burgos)," *Madrider Mitteilungen* 6 (1965): 139-166 + pls.

Todorov, T. "The Origin of Genres." [trans. R. M. Berrong] *New Literary History* 8 (1976): 159-170.

Tynianov, J. "De l'évolution littéraire." *Théorie de la littérature: Texts des formalistes russes.* Ed. and trans. T. Todorov. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1965. 120-137. [Written in 1927, and originally published in *Arxaisty i novatory*, Leningrad, 1929, 30-47].

Van Beek, C. I. M. I., ed. *Passio Sanctarum Perpetuae et Felicitatis.* Vol. I Nijmegen: Dekker & Van de Vegt, 1936. [Rev.: E. Ruprecht, *Gnomon* 16 (1940): 143-144].

Waszink, J. H., ed. Tertullian. *De anima.* Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing, 1947.

Wilson-Kastner, P. et al. *A Lost Tradition: Women Writers of the Early Church.* Washington, D.C.: University P of America, 1981.

Winkler, J. J. *Auctor & Actor: A Narratological Reading of Apuleius' Golden Ass.* Berkeley: U of California P, 1985.

Wolpers, T. *Die englischen Heiligenlegenden des Mittelalters: Eine Formgeschichte des Legendenerzählens von der spätantiken lateinischen Tradition bis zur Mitte des 16. Jahrhunderts.* Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1964.

NOTES

[1] Pick up a standard modern commentated text of a classical author and you will find the following: 1) The author and text in relation to past authors and texts within the same genre; 2) the relation of the author to the text (often with Latin texts, relation of this text to Greek texts in the same genre); 3) technical discussions (e.g., meters for poetic texts, rhetorical devices for prose texts, etc.); 4) constitution of the text (manuscripts, text tradition, testimonies). Only then is the text presented, to be followed by the line-by-line commentary. Note how the order reflects the privileging of basically non-literary factors.

[2] Leclercq's comment at the beginning of his study of the *Passio Perpetuae* and the *Acta* about the value of the literarily inferior *Acta* is typical: "Quelques auteurs ont vainement tenté d'en defendre *l'autorité*" [sc. of the Acta]; "la plupart des *historiens* récents n'y voient, à juste titre, qu'un exercice d'hagiographie rédigé peut-être au IVe siècle d'après la Passio *primitive*" (395) [my emphases]. See below, fn. 20.

[3] Delehaye, who treats the *Acta* at length, is given to statements like: "notre hagiographe n'a fait que développer un thème déjà devenu banal" (70); and "le sans-gêne et la négligence sont *de tradition* dans le métier du remanieur, et qu'il serait illusoire de chercher des motifs raisonnés ou des intentions mystérieuses aux *moindres* modifications qu'ils font subir aux textes" (71) [my emphases].

[4] This assumption is so accepted that Dronke begins his book *Woman Writers* with a chapter on this text. He regards Perpetua's narrative (chaps 3-10) as non-fiction in an insightful analysis of what he calls the " 'outer' depiction of what befell her, and [the] 'inner' one, of her dream-images and secret thoughts." He contrasts this part with that of the redactor who, he says (15), "adds many edifying details that are quite alien to the Perpetua of the diary, and are almost certainly fictitious." The tendentious nature of

criticism that employs language like "secret thoughts" and "almost certainly fictitious" should be noted.

[5] For a full discussion of authorship see Van Beek, 92*-96*. Van Beek's own view, that both the Greek and Latin version are the work of one author and that he was Tertullian, is rejected by E. Rupprecht, 144, as being both unlikely and, in any case, unprovable. Fridh suggests that it is probable (but not proved) that the latin texts of the diary of Perpetua and the work of the author/redactor are original, but that the diary of Saturus originally was in Greek (80). L. Robert, who takes no notice of Fridh's essay, concludes from his analysis of content in particular that Perpetua wrote her diary in Greek. Although the late scholar was an expert in epigraphy and knew how to analyze historical evidence, his lack of literary acumen and refusal to consider opposing views, vitiates an otherwise important study of this work.

[6] *Clavis Patrum Latinorum* 32. *BHL* 6633: *Passio*; 6634-36: The two versions of the *Acta* (6634: A form 1, 6635 A form 2; 6636 B); *BHG* 1482: the Greek version of the *Passio*.

[7] For a careful discussion of the date, see Barnes, "Pre-Decian," 522-525; *Tertullian*, 263-265.

[8] Van Beek calls the shorter forms the *Acta* only to distinguish them from the longer *Passio*. In the MSS, both versions are consistently entitled *Passio* (58-59 app. crit.).

[9] Delehaye, 63, divides the work as follows:

the prologue
a short introduction
the narrative of Perpetua
  consisting of visions on the eve of her martyrdom
the vision of Saturus
the narrative of the redactor
the epilogue.

[10] Fontaine seems to suggest that there was both a redactor and a recasting editor (87); elsewhere, he speaks of an "editor" (83) and "author of our preface" (84).

[11] The literary histories and texts are misleading in calling the *Acta* the *Acta brevia* or the abridged *Acta* (so, e.g., Amat). Although the *Acta* deals with the same events as the *Passio*, and has many similarities, it is not derived directly from it, as even differences in the handling of the materials indicate. The differences in the facts are listed by van Beek, 98*ff., who, however, believes that the writer of the text of the *Acta* used the *Passio* (104*ff.). Like others before him, van Beek regards treatment of similar material as proof of interrelationship. Barnes, *Tertullian* 265, dismisses the *Acta* saying that they "are clearly derivative from the *passio* and possess no independent value." He bases this view entirely on van Beek, 98*ff.

[12] Monceaux, 77-80, is the only scholar to give serious attention to the *Acta*.

[13] Van Beek, 105*f., gives the incipits and explicits of both versions, and discusses the minor discrepancies.

[14] Van Beek knows of some 76 MSS containing the *Acta* in version *A*, 13 containing *B*. The codices used by van Beek in establishing his text of *A* range in date from the twelfth to the fifteenth century. For his text of *B* he used a MS dating from s. viii/ix (Munich clm 4554, CLA 9.1242), with others ranging from s. xi to s. xvii (a MS from Trier dated to 1627).

[15] For the Latin and Greek versions of this text, see Robinson, 112-117.

[16] "Filiam tuam, pater, si vis vere esse perpetuam, nisi per Christi confessionem ad perennem et beatam vitam et praesentis saeculi contemptum non potest pervenire" (2.2).

[17] The texts do not make clear whether the term "brother" refers to a blood brother or to a "brother in Christ."

[18] This version, with Saturus and Perpetua both at the foot of the ladder and the garden with the Good Shepherd on the same level, is that which seems to lie behind the illustration of the scene on an early Christian (perhaps 4th century) sacrophagus from Quintana-Bureba (Spain) now in the museum at Burgos. See Schlunk, 153-164.

[19] "ego ad aeternam vitam et perennem splendorem per temporalia supplicia opto pervenire."

[20] "Pater noli vereri: Perpetuam enim filiam tuam, si non obstiteris, perpetuam filiam possidebis."

[21] For the problems created by the various points of view presented in the *Metamorphoses* see J. J. Winkler. In *De civitate Dei* 18.18, Augustine takes seriously the possibility that Apuleius by taking a potion was turned into an ass: "... sicut Apuleius in libris, quos asini aurei titulo inscripsit, sibi ipsi accidisse, ut accepto veneno humano animo permanente asinus fieret, aut indicavit aut finxit." Note that Augustine does not refer to the character, Lucius.

[22] T. Todorov, "Origin," 164, 161. A slightly expanded version of this essay appears as "L'origine des genres," *Les genres du discours*, Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1978, 44-60; the comment cited appears on p. 47.

[23] "Ceux qui n'ont étudié la transmission de la pensée que dans les chefs-d'œuvre de la littérature classique ont peine à se rendre compte des conditions dans lesquelles nous sont parvenus les monuments antiques du culte des saints. Dans les textes qu'ils ont l'habitude de manier, c'est presque partout la fixité, l'immobilité à peine troublée par des accidents dont les lois sont connues, que la psychologie explique et dont elle indique les remèdes. Ce qui les attend sur le terrain de l'hagiographie, c'est l'instabilité et l'arbitraire, un mouvement perpétuel qui rend très difficile à saisir non seulement l'état initial d'un texte, mais un moment donné de son évolution. Le travail accompli au cours des âges sur les classiques est entrepris en vue de les conserver. Tous ceux qui mettent la main à nos textes semblent conspirer pour les altérer" (Delehaye, 366-367).

[24] In a lecture of 9-25-84, "The Regeneration of Genre," R. Cohen suggested many stages. I have been unable to pursue all of them.

[25] Cohen, 1985, 28f. and Cohen, 1986, 214ff. D. LaCapra comments on these pages of Cohen, 1986, in *New Literary History* 17 (1986): 220f.

[26] Cf. Wolpers, 97. Although Tertullian, *De anima* 55.4 cites the vision of Perpetua (4.8) in support of the view that martyrs are in heaven, there is no reason to believe a) that he has confused or conflated the visions of Perpetua and Saturus or b) that he is attributing Montanist views to this *vision*. The argument of a) depends on reading at 55.4 (74.11 Waszink) *commartyres*, a conjecture of Gelenius [Basel 1550], rather than the reading *martyras* of *codex Agobardinus (A)* [Paris BN lat. 1622; s. ix]; b) there is nothing in the view of the privileged status of martyrs that is necessarily Montanist. Perpetua's comment (4.2), "et ego, quae me sciebam fabulari cum Domino," could be added to passages concerning conversations with the Lord (as reported in Tertullian *De anima* 9.4). But the vision of Perpetua is very different in occasion and substance from that of the Montanist

Priscilla (reported in Epiphanius *Panarion* 49.1.9), which may have involved a conversation with Christ. And it should be emphasized that at no time does Perpetua see herself as a prophet who reveals mysteries to her people. See Waszink, 167-173. As Saxer states (76, fn. 69), "it is sufficient to interpret the passage of Tertullian along the same lines as others which are inspired by Apc 6:9 ["vidi subtus altare animas interfectorum propter verbum Dei et propter testimonium quod habebant" Vulg]." Cf. Waszink, 553-554, 561-562, who offers the arguments on both sides of these questions.

Nor does the witness of Tertullian tell us whether or not he had read the *Passio* in its present form. The sentence reads: "Quomodo Perpetua, fortissima martyr, sub die passionis in revelatione paradisi solos illic martyras vidit, nisi quia nullis romphaea paradisi ianitrix cedit nisi qui in Christo decesserint, non in Adam?" ("How was Perpetua, the courageous martyr, able to have at the approaching day of her passion, the revelation of paradise and could only perceive there the martyrs alone, if not because that sword of fire, guardian of paradise, did not allow entry to any other than to those who died in Christ and not in Adam?") [Waszink 74, 10-13].

[27] We can tell where the interruption ends by the "ring-composition"-like repetitions: "Itaque et nos" picked up by "et nos itaque."

[28] Possible parallels: Rom 12:3—dico enim per gratiam quae data est mihi omnibus qui sunt inter vos. I Cor 7:17—nisi unicuique sicut divisit dominus. Rom 12:6—habentes autem donationes secundum gratiam quae data est nobis differentes sive prophetiam secundum rationem fidei. I Cor 12:4—divisiones vero gratiarum sunt idem autem Spiritus et divisiones ministrationum sunt idem autem Dominus et divisiones operationum sunt idem vero Deus qui operatur omnia in omnibus. Heb 1:14—nonne omnes sunt administratorii spiritus in ministerium missi propter eos qui hereditatem capient salutis.

[29] Of this phrase Fontaine has written, "... cette longue phrase permet-elle de constater comment une prose spécifiquement chrétienne naît ici de la paraphrase scripturaire qui est à l'origine de tous les futurs genres littéraires exégétiques. L'Écriture y est déjà employée comme un langue, par un écrivain qui en est profondément imbu." He suggests that the technique is similar to that of *midrash*, including the teaching of Christ and the apostles, even within an appeal to Old Testament texts (82).

[30] Dronke, 282, fn 2 (ii) does Jacobus de Voragine an injustice in suggesting that he invented the "coarsened hagiographic clichés" in which Perpetua violently rejects her family. Among the details he thinks Jacobus invented: the "most wretched husband who will not be able to live on after you" (*A* 6.2 [her father's speech]: "huic infelicissimo viro tuo, certe vel parvulo huic qui post te vivere non poterit"); that Perpetua allegedly "hurls down" her child (*A* 6.6: "at illa proiciens infantem"; *B* 6.6: "Beata vero Perpetua proiciens infantem"); that she curses her family in biblical tones: Depart from me, you enemies of God, for I know you not (*A* 6.6: "Recedite [Discedite *B*] a me operarii iniquitatis quia non novi vos"); the Prefect orders her and the other Christians to be whipped (*A* and *B* 7.1).

[31] The notion she is a slave is doubtful, and she is certainly not Perpetua's servant.

[32] "Et retuli statim fratri meo: et intelleximus passionem esse futuram, et coepimus nullam iam spem in saeculo habere."

[33] *A* 3.8: "at vero illi cum haec audissent, gratias agentes insufficienter Domino cognoverunt se ex revelatione beatissimae Perpetuae ad martyrii coronam dignos esse effectos"; *B* offers a similar statement.

[34] The absence of the dream of Saturus in the *Acta* is probably to be explained by the local references to ecclesiastical disputes and earlier prosecutions of Christians. Its absence from the *Acta* may also support the hypothesis of Fridh (fn. 5, above) that this vision was originally written in Greek.

[35] Finley, 6, remarks that ancient historians are led astray by two unexpressed propositions: that Greek and Latin texts from antiquity are privileged and thus statements made in literary or documentary sources are to be accepted unless they can be disproved; and that literary evidence has an automatic priority over other types of evidence (thus, the historian is wont to ask of an archaeological find whether it supports or denies the literary tradition).

[36] Leclercq, col. 409. He states (following Monceaux, 81f.) that the *Passio* and the *Acta* were directed to different audiences. The *Passio* to those who knew how to read, the *Acta* to those who only knew how to listen in church to a liturgical reading inserted within the divine office. For this reason it had to be concise and modelled on forms commonly adopted. Thus the *Passio* was a book for private edification, the *Acta* a public recitation. Unfortunately, this argument fails to take into account that in his sermons on Perpetua and Felicity Augustine assumes a knowledge of the *Passio*, since he mentions details of the visions and events in the arena that do not appear in the *Acta*. Even stronger evidence is his discussion of the *pietas* Perpetua shows towards her father and the fact that Augustine notes her husband was not present (Serm. 281.2: "Nec [diabolus] maritum supposuit, ne illa quae iam superna cogitatione habitabat in caelis, suspicionem desiderii carnis erubescendo permaneret fortior; sed patrem verbis deceptionis instruxit, ut religiosus animus, qui non molliretur voluptatis instinctu, pietatis impetu frangeretur"). This statement would make no sense to an audience that had just heard her pompous rejection of her father, mother, husband, child, and brothers in the *Acta* (6.1-6). Delehaye (71f.) evinces other arguments to show that Augustine must have read and used the *Passio* in his sermons.

Bloomington, Indiana 47405, Ballantine 547
Department of Classical Studies

Vigiliae Christianae 45 (1991), 242-254, E. J. Brill, Leiden

BARNABAS 9:4: A PECULIAR VERSE ON CIRCUMCISION

BY

J. N. B. CARLETON PAGET

In recent times interest in the study of Epistle of Barnabas has centered on the author's use of sources.[1] One of the results of this approach has been the realisation that material in the epistle previously regarded as anti-Jewish is taken from Judaism itself. Hence to describe the author as anti-Jewish is to misrepresent him. So R. A. Kraft, in his review of P. Prigent's 1961 publication, writes: "One would do well to dismiss this term (anti-Jewish) altogether from the description of the epistle."[2] Not only is this statement a little unimaginative (a criticism extra muros is in tone quite different from a criticism intra muros), but it fails to take account of harsh statements in the epistle that, in the opinion of the present writer, come from the pen of Barnabas himself (from now on B.). It is the aim of this paper to examine a verse in which such a statement occurs, and argue for the uniqueness of its sentiment, claiming that it originates with its author. In a broader context an attempt will be made to show how the verse illuminates the situation B. is addressing.

At the beginning of the second section of his discussion of circumcision B. writes: ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡ περιτομή, ἐφ' ᾗ πεποίθασιν, κατήργηται. περιτομὴν γὰρ εἴρηκεν οὐ σαρκὸς γενηθῆναι. ἀλλὰ παρέβησαν, ὅτι ἄγγελος πονηρὸς ἐσόφιζεν αὐτούς (B.9:4). K. Lake translates: "But moreover the circumcision in which they trusted has been abolished. For he declared that circumcision is not of the flesh, but they erred because an evil angel was deceiving them."[3]

An alteration of this rendering might be suggested at two points. First, the perfect passive κατήργηται should be translated as 'rejected',[4] for this more clearly conveys the idea indicated in the verse, that literal circumcision never had any validity in the eyes of God; 'abolish' implies that it did.[5] Secondly, παρέβησαν is better translated as 'sinned' (not 'erred'). This is significant, because in the *LXX* παραβαίνω is used frequently to describe the sins of Israel against God.[6] Hence the use of this

word implies that for B. the literal implementation of circumcision is a sin against God, a statement that constitutes an extraordinary inversion of the Genesis account, where it is stated that he who is not circumcised "shall be cut off from the kin of his father" (Gen. 17:14). B. goes further in his inversion of canonical traditions by claiming that the commandment was the work of an evil angel. Bardenhewer was accurate when he wrote that, according to B., "beruhte der jüdische Gebrauch der Beschneidung nicht auf göttlicher Einsetzung, sondern auf einer Täuschung der Juden durch einen bösen Engel."[7] In effect B. has demonised the covenantal rite.

In the first part of this paper I will undertake to discover the possible sources or theological influences behind this verse.

What B. writes in 9:4 appears partly an attempt to support his highly symbolical interpretation of the rite (see what precedes and follows this verse). Nowhere does he deny that there was a commandment to circumcise; he merely refutes the belief that the command was ever meant literally. In adopting such an allegorical understanding of the rite, he was journeying down an exegetical path well trodden by his Jewish predecessors. Such an interpretation appears in partial form in the prophetic insistence on the circumcision of the heart, but finds its clearest surviving expression in Philo. So, for instance, the latter writes: "I consider circumcision to be a symbol of the things most necessary to our well being. One is the excision of pleasures which bewitch the mind ... The other reason is that a man should know himself and banish from the soul grievous maladies." (*De Spec. Leg.* I 8-10). He expresses similar views in *Quaest. Gen.* 3:45-6; *Quaest. Ex.* 2:2; *Agr.* 39, and *Somn.* 2:25.[8] However, while Philo is willing to endorse the application of the allegorical method to circumcision, nowhere does he deny that circumcision was meant to be implemented literally (in contrast to B.). Indeed, in *De Spec. Leg.* and *Quaest. Gen.*, he appends sound medical reasons for circumcision;[9] while in *De Mig. Abr.* he explicitly rejects the argument that an allegorical interpretation of the rite excludes de facto a literal interpretation.[10]

This final passage is especially noteworthy, informing us, albeit in threadbare form, that some Jews, favouring a more abstract interpretation of Torah, disregarded its literal intention. It has been suggested that B., particularly at this point in his epistle, is indebted to a Jewish tradition emanating from such a group.[11]

Even if this were the case, that would account only for the κατήργηται

of 9:4, and not the πονηρὸς ἄγγελος. Reference at this point might also usefully be made to the practice, evidenced amongst certain Jews, of *epispasm* (the concealing of circumcision by the surgical lengthening of the foreskin), though whether those who had this operation done belonged to a group similar to that mentioned in Philo, remains questionable. Motivations for *epispasm* were social and economic, as well as theological. Furthermore, *epispasm* could be said to be in accord with the commandment of Genesis; those who adopted it had in the past already been circumcised.[12]

The question whether newly baptised gentile Christians should be circumcised was from a very early stage a burning issue in the Christian community. That this controversy arose only because of antipathy amongst a body of Christians towards the observance prescribed in the Law seems highly unlikely. Much more probable is the view that the dispute reflected a genuine ambiguity in Judaism as to whether proselytes should be circumcised.[13] Paul's argument that circumcision was unnecessary for the Gentile convert most likely arose from what E. P. Sanders has called his 'exclusivist soteriology' (that is, salvation is through Christ alone; therefore there is no need for anything else). In Galatians, a letter addressed to a church in the throes of a 'Judaising' crisis, Paul has some brutal things to say about circumcision, at one point comparing it to a form of mutilation.[14] Indeed at 5:2, the act of circumcision becomes the means by which a Christian cuts himself/herself off from Christ.[15] Not even here, however, where Paul is at his most acrimonious, is circumcision denied a valid role in the history of Israel, let alone imputed to the inspiration of a demon. Furthermore, it is important to balance this negativism with the sober tone of Romans where circumcision is accorded a rightful place in salvation history (see particularly ch.4).

Certain early church fathers appear to adopt a position similar to that of Paul. Hence while most are clear that the requirement of circumcision is superseded by the gospel (Origen *C. Cels* 2:7), they seek to find in it a spiritual significance (Justin *Dial.* 41:4; Origen *Comm. on Matt.* 12:4; *De Princ.* 2:6,7), on many occasions interpreting it as a type of baptism (*Dial.* 29:1; Origen *Hom. on Jos.* 5:6). The most sharply negative critique of the rite comes in Justin. Writing after the Bar Cochba revolt, he sees circumcision merely as a mark designed to make the Hadrianic ban on Jews entering Jerusalem easier to implement (*Dial.* 16:2-3; 19:2; 92:1-3). Such a punitive interpretation of circumci-

sion is certainly harsh, but it is some distance from B.'s vituperative tone. Indeed in this respect it is interesting to note how Christian writers, however virulently anti-Jewish they might have been (and this is the case even with John Chrysostom), never indulged in popular pagan polemic against the rite, as witnessed in Petronius, Martial, Tacitus, and Juvenal.[16]

Three points emerge from this brief consideration of Jewish and early Christian understandings of circumcision. First, a spiritual interpretation of the rite existed long before B. This interpretation reaches its clearest expression in Philo. Secondly, in *De Mig. Abr.* Philo gives evidence of a body of Jews who interpreted the act of circumcision, along with other commandments of the Torah, in an exclusively allegorical sense. These people might have been, as Prigent suggested, the exegetical ancestors of B. Thirdly, even if we accept Prigent's tentative suggestion (point 2), the theological antecedents of B.'s *demonisation* of the rite are still unclear.

In Gal. 3:19 Paul writes: τί οὖν ὁ νόμος; τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν προσετέθη ἄχρις οὗ ἔλθῃ τὸ σπέρμα ᾧ ἐπήγγελται, διαταγεὶς δι' ἀγγέλων ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου. In the context of the present discussion the importance of this verse lies in its attribution of the giving of the Law to angels. Scholars have for a long time argued over the moral quality of these angels. Most are agreed that Paul does not think of them as evil,[17] but mentions them to show that the Law is mediated rather than directly revealed. Whatever the answer to this question, there is here an early Christian statement to the effect that the law is given by angels, and this tradition is used in a negative sense. This usage contrasts strongly with that found in Judaism where the presence of the angels at Mt. Sinaï becomes a means of further extolling the glory of Torah. Thus in the texts which link angels and the *nomothesis*, cited by Strack and Billerbeck,[18] only one has a negative slant (*Pesiq* 107b), while the others (see, inter alia, the *LXX* of Dt. 33:2; *Pesiq R.* 21 (104a); *Mekh. Ex.* 20:18 (78b); *Sabb.* 88a) have a positive one. Further examples of this association of angels and the Law appear in Josephus who at one point in his *Antiquities* writes: "And we have learnt the noblest of our doctrines and the holiest of our laws from angels sent by God,"[19] and *The Book of Jubilees*, where the Angel of Presence commanded by God (1:27), dictates the Law to Moses (2:1).[20] Is it not reasonable to argue that B., familiar with this tradition that attributed angelic inspiration to the Law and this in a positive light, has quite deliberately given it a negative twist—inspired perhaps

by Paul's negative, albeit milder usage, witnessed in Galatians[21]—and then has concentrated the negativism more narrowly on circumcision?

Jewish angelology provides us with further clues concerning the theological provenance of B.'s harsh sentiment. Jewish literature is replete with evil angels. For instance, Philo in *De Gig.* 16[22] writes: "So, too, you also will not go wrong if you reckon as angels, not only those who are worthy of the name ... but also those who are unholy and unworthy of the title." He cites Ps. 78:49 as proof that these malicious agents exist. "He sent upon them the anger of his wrath, wrath and anger and affliction, a mission of evil angels", and then goes on the explain how these figures deceive men into leading noxious lives by playing on their sense perceptions.[23]

Even more significant are the references to evil agents in the pseudepigraphic literature. In this respect special attention should be paid to *The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs.* Here the angels function as pervasive and pernicious influences in the present age, always willing to attack men openly or surrepetitiously. Chief amongst their roles is that of deceiving men into committing sins against God. So we read in Dan 5:5: "And you are motivated to all evil by the spirits of deceit (τῶν πνευμάτων τῆς πλάνης)". The notion that angels deceive, constantly repeated in the *Testaments*,[24] should be seen as a close parallel to B.'s attribution of deceitful qualities to the evil angel (in 9:4), implied by his use of ἐσόφιζεν.[25]

Some scholars have ignored any connection with classical Jewish angelology, and explained B.9:4 in terms of Gnostic/Marcionite influence. Windisch is typical when he writes: "Die Zurückführung der doch im Gesetz ausdrücklich befohlenen Beschneidung auf Betörung durch einen bösen Engel führt den Barnabas dicht an gnostische Vorstellungen heran."[26] Such a hypothesis is based upon the tradition, found in the early church fathers, that Marcion attributed an evil personality to the Demiurge, or Creator God of the Old Testament. This interpretation is inadequate on two grounds. First, the moral quality of the Marcionite Demiurge is not as unambiguous as some would lead us to believe. While it is true that Irenaeus can impute to Marcion a view of the Demiurge as "malorum factor et bellorum concupiscens et inconstans quoque sententia et contrarius sibi ipse", at another point the same man can write that in his subject's theological scheme there are two gods, one good, and the other, in fact, 'judicialis'. A similar ambiguity exists in Tertullian's *Adversus Marcionem* (See 1:6; 5:13 and 5:18).[27] Secondly,

for Marcion the whole of the Old Testament is a tale of the work of the Demiurge. For B. alone the circumcision legislation is his work, and this only in its literalist form.[28] Furthermore, we should be cautious in describing the πονηρὸς ἄγγελος as an entity equivalent to the Demiurge; it is *an* evil angel, not *the* evil angel.

This final observation that B. has restricted the work of the evil angel to the issuing of the circumcision law, acts as a pointer to another contributory factor in the creation of this verse, namely the belief that the Law could contain false precepts. This is most radically and dramatically stated in Ezekiel 20:25 where it is written: "So I gave them commandments that were not good, and ordinances in which they should not live." In his commentary, Zimmerli, rejecting theories of interpolation, or mollifying textual reconstructions,[29] writes: "The statement that Yahweh makes his law ... the occasion of punishment is quite unique in the Old Testament."[30] Certain early church fathers were quick to exploit the verse for anti-Jewish purposes. For instance, Irenaeus (*Adv. Haer.* 4.15.1), in distinguishing between the good and natural precepts of the ten commandments and the existentially enslaving ritual law, writes: "But when they turned back themselves to make a calf ... they were placed for the future in a state of servitude suited to their wish. As Ezekiel the prophet writes ..." And he then proceeds to quote the above passage.[31] Origen (*C. Cels* 7:20; *Ex. Hom.* 7:2) indulges in exegesis of the same text, claiming that the bad statutes constitute the Jewish law interpreted in a literal sense.

Not directly related to Ezekiel 20:25, but nevertheless germane to the idea that false precepts existed in the Old Testament, is *The Letter of Ptolemy to Flora.*[32] This document is evidence of apparent controversy (from perhaps the same provenance as B., namely Egypt) about the origins of the Law. Some, it seems, claimed that the Law was promulgated by God, while others, "taking the opposite road, insist that our corruptor and adversary (ἀντικειμένου φθοροποιοῦ διαβόλου) the Devil, promulgated it ..."[33] Ptolemy rejects both these extremes, as he sees them, preferring a modified form of the false precepts argument in which he differentiates between three types of legislation in the Old Testament: that of God, in Ptolemy's scheme *the Demiurge*, that of Moses, and that of the fathers. The latter two are seen as contrary to God, and as either abolished or modified by the coming of Christ. (It should be noted that he divides up the law of God into three: good laws associated with the Decalogue, those that have an admixture of evil and

righteousness, and those that are typical and symbolic.) This position gives us a matrix out of which B.'s idea of demonised circumcision becomes understandable, particularly in respect of hermeneutical method (what you do not like in the Law you impute to agents lesser than God). That B. has sought refuge in evil agencies makes him in one respect closer to those opponents of Ptolemy who attribute the giving of the law to the Devil. The fact that he does this for circumcision alone places him closer to the spirit of Ptolemy, though he is a less sophisticated thinker than the Valentinian. It would be wrong, however, to argue that this form of thinking was essentially Christian. As Fallon,[34] following Quispel, has noted, the traditions lying behind this sentiment may well have been Jewish. Support for this theory is indicated not only by reference to the Ezekiel passage cited above, but also by reference to the peculiar words found in Strabo, which, probably reflecting a marginal Jewish tradition, attribute much of the Pentateuchal laws, including circumcision, to 'tyrannical people.'[35]

Finally, and closely connected to the preceding point, reference ought to be made to the theological technique, found amongst both Jews and Christians, of imputing the teaching or activity of one's opponent to the work of a demon (what Lampe has elsewhere called "the demonology of prophecy"). This is most famously exemplified in Mk.3, where the Pharisees, unable to deny the actual fact of Jesus' miracles, argue for their demonic inspiration; and in Jn. 8:44 where the failure of the Jews to believe that Jesus comes from God leads to the accusation that they are "of their father, the devil." Similar language is found in Paul (2 Cor.11:3; Gal.3:1), Ignatius (Eph.10:3; 17:1), Justin (*Dial.* 35), and most of the heresiologists.

From all the above investigation, we can argue that what B. has written at 9:4 is unique in the limited sense of that word. That is, while the specific demonisation of circumcision is unique (insofar as we know), the traditions and theological premises lying behind it can be discerned through careful study. Of its anti-Jewish quality there can be no doubt.

Some commentators have sought, however, to water down these conclusions. So Kraft calls into question the view that any part of ch.9 can be called anti-Jewish. He writes, "Ps.B. is much more interested in arguing (in the chapter) that he who has a right understanding has the true circumcision instead of arguing against circumcision itself."[36] While this is true of 9:1-3 and 9:7f., it too easily overlooks the negativism of 9:4 and what follows in vv.5-6. Interestingly, some

scholars regard these verses (4-6) as interpolatory precisely because of their harshness of tone. So Robillard[37] argues that originally the section beginning from 9:1 was merely a conventional Jewish argument in favour of a spiritualist interpretation of circumcision, but that an editor, writing during the Bar Cochba revolt and entertaining understandably hostile opinions of his Jewish brothers, has given the whole passage an anti-Jewish hue by inserting 9:4-6. While I do not hold to Robillard's view that 9:4f. is an interpolaton in the sense that it has been added to a pre-existent text of the epistle, the case he makes for seeing 9:4f. as strangely anti-Jewish in relation to the material surrounding it, and as therefore affecting the overall interpretation of the chapter, is well founded.[38]

Kraft's argument might still seem powerful, however, if we take into account 9:7f., for here in contradiction to 9:4, physical circumcision is accorded a positive value. As D. Völter has written: "...derjenige, der in IX:7-9 als den Urheber der Beschneidung den Abraham nennt und ihn dabei auf Christum hinblicken lässt, kann nicht vorher gesagt haben, die Juden hätten bloss durch einen bösen Engel verführt die Beschneidung angenommen."[39] But against this two counters can be made. First, B. attributes such a positive value to Abraham's circumcision only. Secondly, he is forced to do this because in the Bible Abraham actually is circumcised. Furthermore, we may see it as part of his general exegetical technique of implicating as many as possible of the Old Testament alumni into his christological cast (see 6:8; 12:2; 12:10; 13:4-5).[40]

In refutation of the view that the verse is original to B., Wengst (amongst others)[41] has argued that it goes back to a pre-existent source. But such an argument seems to the present writer to overlook clear indications in the verse of its Barnabite origin. These will be enumerated below.

First, B.'s introduction of the verse by ἀλλὰ καὶ adds to it a certain intrusive quality, though the words could merely be proof of a crude redactional method whereby different sources are kneaded together with the addition of the odd connecting phrase. The use of a form of καταργέω in 9:4a constitutes, moreover, a second and more convincing argument, recalling 2:6 and 16:2, where the writer uses the same verb in the typically Barnabite fashion of 'reject' (for this see above). A third, and decisive argument lies in the presence of ἐσόφιζεν in 9:4c. This verb is only found once elsewhere in the epistle, and there in a verse that

is clearly written by B. himself. At 5:3a he writes, οὐκοῦν ὑπερευχαριστεῖν ὀφείλομεν τῷ κυρίῳ, ὅτι καὶ τὰ παρεληλυθότα ἡμῖν ἐγνώρισεν καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐνεστῶσιν ἡμᾶς ἐσόφιζεν.[42] It is interesting to note that here σοφίζω appears with God as the subject, but in 9:4c it is the evil angel who is the subject. I would contend, however, that it is a typically Barnabite touch to make an evil agent the subject when applied to the Jews, and God the subject when applied to the Christians. It is well in keeping with the more general contrast B. draws between Christian illumination and Jewish error.[43]

A further observation supports this linguistic argument. Even on a superficial reading of B. it is evident that its author is of a dualistic turn of mind. This present age is an evil one (see 2:1) which, though tempered by the arrival of Christ, remains evil until the return of that same Christ who will usher in the new world (15:5). B.'s particular form of dualism depicts this world as governed by an evil figure (see 2:1, 10; 4:9; 16:7; 18:1; 20:1; 21:3). Indeed, at 2:10 and 21:13 he refers to the figure as πονηρός. Hence it seems reasonable to argue that the use of πονηρὸς ἄγγελος to describe the figure who deceives the Jews into implementing circumcision literally, is wholly in keeping with B.'s generally dualistic view that sees evil personified in an evil figure.

At the end of this paper a number of observations seem in order. First, what we find expressed in B.9:4 is, in relation to the Jewish, early Christian, and Gnostic literature of which we have knowledge, unique. That is not to say, however, that it emerges from a theological vacuum. As our study has shown, B., in attributing physical circumcision to the work of a demon, has melded different traditions, from both Judaism and early Christianity; radicalism emerges out of a peculiar blend of theological ideas. This is typical of the general hermeneutical procedure of the letter. In this respect one need only look at B.'s critique of temple worship, and the covenant where he seems to radicalise criticisms of Judaism, found both within Judaism itself and Christianity. Secondly, the observation that B.9:4 comes from the pen of B. and not simply out of a tradition to which he was privy, is further support to those who see the letter as directed to a situation in which Judaism was perceived as a threat. This threat probably arose from proselytising activity on the part of Jews whose confidence had been revitalised by the prospect of a rebuilt temple. In the face of such a crisis, B. writes a letter in which he negates the view that the Jews ever had a covenantal relationship with God. From the time of Sinaï onwards the history of Judaism has been

one of darkness and misunderstanding. Obviously in such circumstances the question of circumcision would have arisen,[44] just as it had for Paul in Galatia. Indeed so critical an issue was it that B. was not willing simply to argue for the truth of a purely symbolic interpretation of the rite (as he had for sacrifice, the temple and the dietary laws), but to demonise it. In the physical implementation of circumcision the Jews and implicitly those whom they converted, were participating in a demonic act. In the expression of such a sentiment B. holds the dubious distinction of being unique. But the extremity of his interpretation is probably reflective of the extremity of his circumstances.

NOTES

[1] See H. Windisch, *Die apostolischen Väter III. Der Barnabasbrief*, HNT Ergänzungsband (Tübingen, 1920), pp. 219-413, especially pp. 408-411; P. Prigent, *Les Testimonia dans le Christianisme primitif. L'Épître de Barnabé I-XVI et ses sources* (Paris, 1961); R. A. Kraft, *The Epistle of Barnabas: its quotations and sources* (unpublished Harvard dissertation, 1961); K. Wengst, *Tradition und Theologie des Barnabasbriefes* (Berlin and New York, 1971); P. Prigent and R. A. Kraft, *L'Épître de Barnabé* SC 172, Paris, 1971) (From now on *Comm.*).

[2] *JTS* n.s. 13 (1962), p. 405.

[3] K. Lake, *The Apostolic Fathers* (2 vols., Loeb Classical Library, New York and London, 1912), vol. 1, pp. 370-373.

[4] Abolition can seem natural if the epistle is viewed against the background of Hadrian's supposed measures against circumcision (See Spartianus in *SHA* Hadrian 14:2) to which the passage was said to refer by P. Haeuser (*Barnabasbrief neu untersucht und neu erklärt*, Forschungen zur altchristlichen Literatur 11, Paderborn, 1912, p. 58). Such an inference, based upon the passive form of καταργέω, and the omission in the Latin text of the words ἀλλὰ καὶ το γενηθῆναι (L reads; sed praeterierunt, quia angelus nequam docebat illos), is problematic. The perfect passive could refer to the event of the angel's deception, and the omission of the Latin text proves nothing. Furthermore the reliability of the Spartianus account has been called into question. For a defence of Spartianus see E.M. Smallwood in *Latomus* 18 (1957), pp. 334-347, and more recently in *The Jews under Roman Rule* (Leiden, 1981), pp. 428f.

[5] P. Prigent, *Comm.*, p. 84 ad loc. discusses the verb as it appears in B. and opts for a translation by the word 'rejeter'. It is worth noting, however, that in 2:6 a translation by the word 'abrogate' might seem more suitable.

[6] See inter alia Lev. 26:40; Nu. 14:1; Jos. 7:11; 3 Macc. 7:10; 4 Macc. 13:15.

[7] *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur* I (Freiburg, 1902), p. 88.

[8] For a discussion of these references especially those in *De Spec. Leg.* see R. D. Hecht, 'Philo's interpretation of circumcision' in *Nourished by Peace: studies in Hellenistic Judaism in memory of S. Sandmel*, edd. F. E. Greensphan, E. Hilgert, B. L. Mack (Denver, 1984), pp. 51-79.

[9] In *De Spec. Leg.* 1:6-7, he describes how circumcision frees one from chronic inflammation of the prepuce, and is an aid to fertility.

[10] *De Mig. Abr.* 92 reads: "It is true that circumcision does indeed portray the excision of pleasure ... but let us not on this account lay down the law for circumcising." (μηδ'...ἀνέλωμεν τὸν ἐπὶ τῇ περιτομῇ τεθέντα νόμον).

[11] In this respect see P. Prigent (p. 145 of *comm.*): "Ces gens que Philon décrit ... peuvent-ils être considerés comme les auteurs de la tradition utilisée ici par Ps. B." But further on he continues: "Ce serait bâtir une hypothèse sur une base singulièrement étroite. Disons seulement que ce florilège est une œuvre chrétienne, mais le Judaïsme en a préparé les voies."

[12] Such a phenomenon is most famously witnessed in 1 Macc. 1:15 (καὶ ἐποίησαν ἑαυτοῖς ἀκροβυστίας), and inveighed against, at least implicitly, in Jub. 15:9-34. That the practice continued a long time after this period appears evident from references to it in the Rabbis and Epiphanius. For a recent discussion of the subject see R. G. Hall, 'Epispasm and the dating of Jewish Christian writings', in *The Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 2 (1988), pp. 71-86.

[13] See N. J. McEleney, 'Conversion, circumcision and the Law', *NTS* 20 (1973), pp. 319-341. For a response to this article see J. Nolland 'Uncircumcised Proselytes', *JSJ* 12 (1981), pp. 173-194.

[14] Gal. 5:12; see also Phil. 3:2.

[15] This might indicate that it has some sort of a demonic quality.

[16] See Petronius *Satyricon* 68:8; Martial *Epigrammata* 7:82; Tacitus *Histories* 5:2 and Juvenal *Satire* 14:96-106. For a possible exception to the view that Christians never indulged in pagan polemic against circumcision see *Diog.* 4:2.

[17] This is not the case with H. J. Schoeps (*Paul*, Lutterworth Press, 1961). He thinks that the angels are "obviously hostile to the Jewish people" (p. 182).

[18] H. L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Midrasch und Talmud* (Munich, 1926), vol. 3, pp. 554-556.

[19] For the argument that ἀγγέλων refers to human agents (e.g. Prophets) see W. D. Davies, 'A note on Josephus *Antiquities* 15:136', *HTR* 47, pp. 135-140; and R. Markus in *Josephus* (10 vols., Loeb classical library, London and New York), vol. 8, pp. 66-67.

[20] On the mediatory role of angels it is interesting to note P. Schäfer's view expressed in his *Rivalität zwischen Engeln und Menschen. Untersuchungen zur Rabbinischen Engelvorstellung* (Studia Judaica 8, Berlin and New York, 1975), pp. 44-51. He argues that in later times the Rabbis, probably under the influence of the kind of exegesis exemplified in Paul, and perhaps B., lessened or excluded this role. My thanks for this reference to O. Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy* (Leiden, 1987), p. 316, n. 164.

[21] Linguistic affinities might suggest a direct reliance upon Paul. See ἄγγελος/δι' ἀγγέλων; παρέβησαν/τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν. The latter parallel is particularly significant given the fact that B. usually characterises Jewish interpretative failures as *error*, not sin. If B. is reliant upon Paul at this point it is odd that he makes no reference to him. Lack of allusions to Paul or to Pauline works is a general and interesting feature of the epistle.

[22] For other references to angels in Philo see *Confus.* 181; *Deus* 157; *Mutat.* 32, 41; *Fuga* 67.

[23] Philo understands the angels to exploit the sensual faculty of man (what he terms the aesthetic. See the words at 17 δι' ἧς ἡ αἴσθησις ἀπατᾶται). B. attributes the failure of the Jews to understand the scriptures to an equivalent sensuality. At 10:9 he writes: "Moses

received three doctrines concerning food and spoke thus in the spirit; but they received them as really referring to food, owing to the lust of their flesh."

[24] It is important to note that in *The Testaments* the activity of the spirits has a mainly anthropological function. As H.W. Hollander and M. de Jonge write: "The emphasis (of the book) lies clearly in the struggle of men in their own personal circumstances with evil influences coming from outside but operating in their minds." (From their commentary on the book, Leiden 1985, p. 50). They continue, however: "Sometimes elements come in which are more clearly mythological." Here they cite particularly references to the promised destruction of Beliar and his evil spirits (T.S. 6:6; 7:6; 18:12). In some respects this combination of the anthropological and mythological has parallels in B. So at 2:10 and 4:9 B. can entertain the idea that the evil angel gains an entrance into the Christian, while in 2:1; 18:1 and 20:1 he can entertain a more mythological viewpoint.

[25] See also in the O.T. the evil spirits sent to create false prophecy (1 Kings 22:22). In the *Book of Jubilees* evil spirits are sent by God to lead men astray (10:2, 8; 15:31), and in *The Damascus Document* 12:2 it is written: "Every man who preaches apostasy under the dominion of the spirits of Satan shall be judged according to the Law." For negative uses of σοφίζω see Philo *Leg. Alleg.* III,64; *Mutat.* 240 and *Joseph* 217.

[26] Op. cit., p. 352. For the earliest expression of this view see F. C. Baur, *Die christliche Gnosis oder die christliche Religionsphilosophie in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung* (Tübingen, 1835), p. 89.

[27] E. C. Blackman in *Marcion and his influence* (London, 1948), pp. 66-67, attributes this ambiguity to a genuine confusedness in the mind of Marcion. This would explain Irenaeus' description of the Demiurge as 'contrarius sibi'.

[28] See Windisch's statement that "Barnabas seine These ausdrücklich nur von diesem einem Institut des jüdischen Zeromonialswesens behauptet ...", op. cit. p. 352.

[29] See J. A. Bewer, 'Textual and exegetical notes on the Book of Ezekiel', *JBL* 72 (1953), pp. 159-161.

[30] *Commentary on Ezekiel*, edd. F. M. Cross and E. Baltzer (Fortress Press, 1979), p. 411.

[31] Such a view can be seen to be linked to the argument, found particularly in Justin, that the laws given after the episode of the Golden Calf (mainly the ritual laws), constituted an accommodation to the idolatrous tendencies of the Jews (named by M. Simon 'The homeopathic argument'). For the possible connection between 9:4 and this anti-Jewish argument see O. Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy* (Leiden, 1987), pp. 315-316.

[32] For text see G. Quispel, *Ptolémée: lettre à Flora* (SC 24, Paris, 1950). The letter is taken from Epiphanius' *Panarion* 33:3-8.

[33] Epiphanius, *Panarion*, 33.3.2. The translation is from *Biblical Interpretation*, ed. J. W. Trigg, (Michael Glazier, 1988), p. 61. For a similar dissectory approach to the O.T. see Rhodon in his book *Against the Marcionites*, who, according to Eusebius (*H.E.* 5.13.2.), mentions a Marcionite sect, led by Apelles, who believed in one *arche* (μίαν ἀρχὴν ὁμολογεῖ) but attributed the prophets to an opposing spirit (τὰς δὲ προφητείας ἐξ ἀντικειμένου λέγει πνεύματος).

[34] See his 'The Law in Philo and Ptolemy: A note on the *Letter to Flora', VC* 30 (1976), pp. 45-51. For a further discussion of the idea of false precepts see G. Strecker, *Das Judenchristentum in den Pseudoklementinen* (Berlin, 1958), pp. 166-187, and W. Horbury, 'Old Testament interpretation in the Church Fathers', in *Mikra*, edd. M. J. Mulder and H. Sysling (Assen and Philadelphia, 1988), pp. 759-760.

[35] "His (Moses') successors for some time abided by the same course, acting righteously and being truly pious towards God; but afterwards, in the first place, superstitious men (δεισιδαιμόνων) were appointed to the priesthood, and then tyrannical people (τυραννικῶν ἀνθρώπων); and from superstition arose abstinence from flesh ... and circumcision and excisions and other observances of the same kind." Strabo, *Geography*, 16.2.37. For further comments on the passage see M. Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism* 1 (Jerusalem, 1984), pp. 306f.; and J. C. H. Lebram, 'Der Idealstaat der Juden' in *Untersuchungen zu Josephus-Studien, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament*, edd. O. Betz, M. Hengel and K. Haacker (Göttingen, 1974), pp. 233-253.

[36] Unpublished thesis, p. 187.

[37] 'L'épître de Barnabé: trois époques, trois théologies, trois rédacteurs", *RB* 78 (1971), pp. 184-207, esp. p. 188, n. 9.

[38] D. Völter (*Die Apostolischen Väter. Neu untersucht* 1, Leiden, 1904, p. 350) comes to the opposite conclusion. He sees 9:4-6 as the earlier text, which in the original letter followed from 5:4. These two verses have been separated from each other by an editor who has added the section 5:4-9:3. This theory is less compelling than Robillard's for it begs the question why the later editor did not simply expunge 9:4-6 from the original letter.

[39] Op. cit., p.350.

[40] For a similar judgment see F. Scorza-Barcellona: "Tuttavia sembra più probabile che Barnaba consideri il rito praticato da Abramo *soltanto* come una prefigurazione di Cristo, e non come una vera circoncisione secondo l'uso di Israele: oppure che consideri *soltanto* il rito praticato da Abramo, e non l'istituzione successiva della circoncisione, che resterebbe opera diabolica." *Epistola di Barnaba* (Turin, 1975), pp. 147-148.

[41] Op. cit., p 36.

[42] See Wengst, op. cit., p. 22, where he himself admits this verse comes from B. "5:3 hätte sich als eine ad hoc Bildung des B. erwiesen."

[43] In this respect see 8:7 and 10:12.

[44] That circumcision was a definite issue seems evident from the fact that in 9:6 B. seems to quote the words of his opponents (see also in this respect 4:6b and 12:10b).

I would like to thank P. Lindsey, F. L. Shaw and Dr. W. Horbury for their help and advice in the writing of this article.

Queens' College, *Cambridge*, England

Vigiliae Christianae 45 (1991), 255-277, E. J. Brill, Leiden

ON CHRISTIAN ATHEISM

BY

JOSEPH J. WALSH

Why were the Christians so unpopular in the first and second centuries? The effects of their unpopularity reveal the significance of the question. With the exception of the Neronian persecution, for the first 100 years private persons, not the Roman government, initiated prosecutions of Christians. Without this popular hostility, prosecutions would not have taken place. Nor would the authorities have acted on these accusations had they not shared to some extent the prejudices and suspicions of the accusors. It was hostility at the popular and official levels which accounted for the afflictions of the Christians of that period.

The question of Christian unpopularity is pertinent to the interpretation of several aspects of early Christianity and ancient culture: how much pagans knew of the new cult; to what extent the pagan impression and opinion of Christianity evolved; what the limits of Greek and Roman tolerance were at the time; and what sort of characteristics were likely to irritate pagans of the empire. Modern scholars most often attribute Christian unpopularity to Christian atheism. This is understandable. Christian "atheism" was certainly the central issue between Christianity and paganism in the 3rd century. Yet this does not necessarily mean that atheism provoked pagan antipathy during Christianity's first hundred years.

In this paper a survey of the evidence of pagan hostility to Christianity up to c. 150 AD will show that atheism played only a small part. Even after 150, other traits contributed to Christian unpopularity as atheism became the principal charge only gradually. Whereas an initial general unfamiliarity with Christianity accounts for pagan ignorance of Christian "atheism," growing awareness (suddenly expanded by historical events of Marcus Aurelius' reign) revealed to pagans the weightier and, from their point of view, wholly valid charge of atheism. This charge was to dominate the religious controversy thereafter. Thus

hatred which had already been engaged found a potent justification.

In fact, several characteristics disagreeable to the pagan community—atheism, separateness, aggressive proselytizing and polemic, secrecy, Jewish origins, apocalyptic expectations, disruption of families—account for hatred of the Christians in the earliest period.[1] The precise chemistry of these characteristics eludes analysis. Still, it is better to acknowledge the frustrating complexity of religious prejudice than to rely on a satisfying but oversimplified explanation for pagan hostility towards the new faith.

1. *The Ancient Evidence*[2]

It must have come to the attention of some pagans very early that Christians did not honor gods other than their own. Christian proselytizing and pagan curiosity would have seen to it that some pagans found out the reason for this, namely, monotheism. The snub to their beliefs and practices might irritate pagans. Some may even have thought that the Christian refusal to honor the gods could disturb the *pax deorum* and hence endanger the general well-being. Most would not have cared as long as conditions were generally peaceful.[3] Historians have maintained that from the very beginning atheism was the principal reason the Christians were hated,[4] and there is apparent support for this assertion. Tertullian, for example, declares in his *Apology*, "sequitur ut eadem ratione pro aliis non sacrificemus, qua nec pro nobis ipsis, semel deos non colendo. itaque sacrilegii et maiestatis rei conuenimur. summa haec causa, immo tota est" (10.1).[5] Yet Tertullian's testimony and the other evidence for this assertion appear considerably later than our period.[6] It remains to be established 1) when atheism is first attested as a cause of pagan hatred of Christians, and 2) whether other reasons for hatred were given before atheism became predominant.

First let us review the Christian evidence. In the first (or beginning of the second) century the author of *1Peter* wrote in oppressive and hostile times (4.12-6), yet criticism of Christianity seems to have been moral and political in the narrowest sense (2.11-7).[7] Clement of Rome in his *1st Epistle to the Corinthians* writes in harsh times as well (5.1-5, 6.1-4, 7.1). Here ζῆλος (5.2,4,5, 6.1,2,3,4), φθόνος (5.2), and ἔρις (5.5, 6.4), not atheism, are deemed responsible for the problems.[8] *The Ascension of Isaiah*, in what is probably an allusion to Peter's martyrdom, contains

nothing of atheism (4.1-3).[9] And, although *Revelation* is preoccupied with oppression of the church and even the church's resistance to emperor worship, there is nothing in its cloudy language to suggest that perceived atheism was the source of popular hostility to the Christians.

Acts reports several confrontations of the Christians with the pagan world. Paul and Silas are accused of undermining Roman customs (ἔθη 16.20-1), of causing unrest and sedition (17.5-9), of maintaining pretentious and unusual deities (17.18).[10] In Paul's confrontations with the Roman governors Felix (23.23-24.27) and Festus (25.1-26.32) and King Agrippa (25.13-26.32),[11] the topic of atheism does not arise. Only at Ephesus (19.23-41), where the silversmith Demetrius incites his fellow smiths and ultimately the general population against Paul, is the Christian rejection of the gods and its provocation of the pagan population an issue (19.25-7). Yet even here, Demetrius' own motivation appears to be economic.[12]

Later Christian sources on the first century either do not mention atheism for this period[13] or are working in a largely embellished tradition[14] which portrays Nero and Domitian as persecutors of the church.[15]

For the first half of the second century there is no evidence in Christian sources that atheism was the cause of pagan hostility to Christianity. During Trajan's reign, as far as we know, atheism is not the issue in Ignatius' or Symeon's martyrdoms.[16]

Quadratus (Eus., *HE* 4.3.1-2; *Chron* ad ann 2140) and Aristides[17] wrote apologies addressed to the emperor Hadrian. There is no mention of atheism in the small fragment of Quadratus in Eusebius. From the extant versions of Aristides' *Apology*, despite a lengthy discourse attacking pagan polytheism and Greek philosophic monotheism, only alleged immorality is mentioned as the source of pagan animosity towards Christianity.[18]

In the reign of Antoninus Pius, the martyrdom of Telesphorus is not connected with atheism in our sources.[19] In the case of Ptolemaeus and Lucius (Justin Martyr, *2nd Apology* 2), a husband's anger at the alienation of his wife is the cause of the arrest.[20]

It is with Justin Martyr, that is, probably c. 150,[21] that atheism appears for the second time in Christian literature as a source of pagan discontent with (and hence persecution of) the Christians (*1st Apology* 4,5,6,13,46; *2nd Apology* 3). Yet even so, as P. A. Brunt has observed, Justin dedicates more attention to *flagitia* than to atheism, especially

compared with later apologists.[22] Although Christian atheism distresses pagans, it is not what troubled them most.

The martyrdoms of Polycarp, Germanicus and others at Smyrna are described in the *Martyrdom of Polycarp.* Here atheism (12.2), and in particular the cry, Αἶρε τοὺς ἀθέους (3.2; 9.2), is attested as of primary importance in popular detestation of the Christians.[23] The event is commonly attributed to the early years of Marcus Aurelius, though 155, the late 150s, and 177, have all found vigorous proponents.[24]

In our pagan sources, the Christians are mentioned for the first time in Trajan's reign, in the writings of Pliny (and Trajan himself), Tacitus and Suetonius. All three express contempt for the new sect, but none mentions atheism as a source of his own or popular hatred, or even indicates awareness of the atheistic nature of Christianity. In describing Nero's good acts Suetonius writes merely, "afflicti suppliciis Christiani, genus hominum superstitionis nouae ac maleficae" (*Nero* 16.2).[25] Not a word of atheism.

In Tacitus' description of the great fire, the Christians are characterized in an even more unflattering manner, "quos per flagitia inuisos uulgus Christianos appellabat...repressaque in praesens exitiabilis superstitio rursum erumpebat, non modo per ludaeam, originem eius mali, sed per urbem etiam, quo cuncta undique atrocia aut pudenda confluunt celebranturque...odio humani generis conuicti sunt...unde quamquam aduersus sontis et nouissima exempla meritos miseratio oriebatur" (*Ann* 15.44). Nothing in Tacitus' description necessarily refers to atheism and much of it suggests other causes for Christian unpopularity. In Tacitus *flagitium* refers exclusively to moral and political crimes and scandal.[26] In what sense Tacitus considered Christianity *exitiabilis* is uncertain, but the text offers no suggestion that he had atheism and the disruption of the *pax deorum* in mind.[27] The context, which suggests that Tacitus knew Christ was executed by a Roman official, and the mention of *flagitia* and *odio humani generis*, indicate that he was thinking of something else.[28] If *humani generis* in the phrase *odio humani generis* is taken as an objective genitive,[29] Tacitus then refers explicitly to Christian hatred for human, not divine, beings,[30] and alludes to their perceived separation from pagan society.[31] *Mali, atrocia* and *pudenda* could refer to virtually anything bad.

Pliny seems to have known next to nothing about the Christians before his investigation.[32] Although he probably discovered at some juncture in his inquiry that the Christians were atheistic, he indicates

this nowhere in his letter. Most significantly, his characterizations of Christianity and Christian behavior reveal that he found the Christians distasteful for other reasons. The word *flagitium* occurs here as in Tacitus. The fact that *flagitium* in Pliny normally refers to moral and political crimes and scandal[33] and that he uses the plural (*flagitiis, flagitia* 10.96.2) and thus is thinking of crimes, not one crime, indicate that the word here, as in Tacitus, denotes immoral and criminal activities.[34] His investigation into the truth concerning these *flagitia* concerned itself with the details of Christian ritual and morals (10.96.7-8). Pliny's word choice in describing the Christians shows that he considered them guilty of excess—"pertinaciam certe et inflexibilem obstinationem" (3), *amentiae* (4),[35] *immodicam* (8)[36]—which does not suggest atheism. *Prauus*[37] and *contagio*[38] are general terms of abuse having no particular religious connotations.[39] The end of the letter where Pliny states that leniency has caused the temples to be full again need not suggest that Pliny's or the accusors' primary concern is Christian atheism. First, Pliny includes this detail to encourage the emperor to adopt leniency toward the apostates.[40] To suggest that the pardoning of Christians has caused the temples to be filled is not to suggest that Christianity was atheistic. It is equally conceivable from Pliny's point of view—and in reality—that devotion to Christ had displaced devotion to the traditional gods without necessitating a rejection of them, since there was no compulsion to participate in pagan cults. An Isis worshipper, for instance, could have lost interest in more traditional divinities without repudiating them. Second, the crowding of the temples need not indicate a revival of interest in pagan ritual. Rather, it is more likely an indication of the fear Pliny's measures inspired in the local populace. Every sensible pagan immediately made a public show of his non-Christianity in order to forestall the possibility of accusation and arrest and, hence, of disgrace and even death. When anonymous accusations, extortion and threats of violence are in the air, few will rely exclusively on the reasonableness and fairness of the authorities to see to it that justice is done.[41] Nor would pagans want to be suspected of embracing Christianity, or even of *having* embraced Christianity, since rumors of ritual atrocities persisted. Nothing in the letter explicitly indicates any popular or official disgruntlement due to Christian atheism. Nor does Trajan mention atheism in his response to Pliny (10.97). Trajan was pleased that people were abandoning a pernicious cult and proving this by returning to the traditional practices Rome approved.

The term *superstitio* (Suet., *Nero* 16.2; Tac., *Ann* 14.30.3; 15.44; *Hist.* 4.54.2, 61.2; Pliny 10.96.8) does not necessarily suggest atheism either.[42] Rather, it indicates either excessive religiosity (including superstition in our sense of the word)[43] as described by Varro and Seneca[44]; or "foreign or non-orthodox religious practices or doctrines,"[45] especially foreign.[46] The closest modern equivalent to this latter sense is 'cult' in the popular usage—a peculiar religion having its roots in mainstream religions but differing from them, or a religion imported from abroad. The tone of disapproval in the word *superstitio* does not limit itself to doctrine[47] and certainly does not necessarily imply atheism.[48] Nor did the Roman need to know much about a new religion to label it a superstition. It sufficed that it was somehow new, foreign and contrary to convention.

From Hadrian's reign we have the emperor's own letter to Minucius Fundanus.[49] Hadrian does not characterize the Christians and says nothing concerning why they were unpopular. The phrase τι παρὰ τοὺς νόμους πράττοντας (Eus., *HE* 4.9.3), however, clearly refers to specific crimes and not to the atheism later associated with the Christian name. Epictetus briefly alludes to the Christians' fearlessness (merely a habit) but nothing else.[50]

In the reign of Antoninus Pius, Apuleius' description of Aemilianus in his *Apology* (c. 158-9) suggests that Aemilianus was a Christian (56). Yet this is not beyond doubt. Even if he was a Christian, his atheism is described at length because of the requirements of the case—Apuleius is expressly contrasting his own religiosity with Aemilianus' atheism—and it is possible that but for the demands of the case Apuleius would not have cared at all. Antoninus Pius' letter to the Council of Asia suggests that Christian unpopularity was caused by the religion's atheistic nature and that Christianity was perceived to have been responsible for natural disasters (Eus., *HE* 4.13.3-4), but it is uncertain whether the letter is essentially genuine, partially a forgery or totally fabricated.[51] If genuine, a date c. 161 seems likely; if a forgery, anytime between 164 and 176 is possible.[52]

From the reign of Antoninus Pius or Marcus Aurelius[53] we have a small fragment from a speech of Fronto preserved in Minucius Felix (*Octavius* 9.8) which makes no mention of atheism. The passage does offer, however, some lurid description of Christian drunkenness, promiscuity and incest.

In Crescens we seem to have the first extant pagan writer to complain

of Christian atheism. Yet because our information depends on Justin Martyr's *2nd Apology* (3), we can only date Crescens' assertions to before the composition of the *Apology*. Unfortunately the date of composition is uncertain, though generally believed to have been around or after 150 AD. All we can say with confidence is that it was written before Justin's death c. 165.[54]

Written in Marcus Aurelius' reign,[55] Apuleius' *Metamorphosis*[56] contains a description of a baker's wife which emphasizes her cruelty, orneriness, wantonness, drunkenness, avarice, prodigality and her monotheism, which causes her to drink early in the morning and engage in promiscuity (9.14). She is probably meant to be a Christian but could be a Jewish proselyte.[57] Her monotheism is emphasized, but in a context of grand immorality which indicates that it was the excesses of the ritual, merely a cover for orgies, which Apuleius found distasteful and not the rejection of the gods.[58]

Lucian alludes to Christian atheism twice. In the *de morte Peregrini*, dater after 165,[59] he gives a brief description of Christians, noting their belief in immortality, their readiness to die, brotherhood, otherworldliness, communism, criminality and atheism (13). Still, atheism is only one of many characteristics Lucian observes, nor is it, apparently, a major source of annoyance to Lucian, who rather mocks Christian simplicity (11-3). Significantly, the description itself indicates that Lucian did not expect all his readers to be familiar with Christianity. In Lucian's *Alexander*, written after 180, Alexander explicitly associates Christians with atheists and Epicureans, hoping to elicit support against these adversaries (25.38).[60]

Galen in various works published between 162 and 192[61] comments briefly on Christians and Jews. Although aware of Christian and Jewish dogmatism, reliance upon faith, the Mosaic 'cosmology' (all of which he criticizes) and Christian ethics,[62] he does not mention Christian atheism. Celsus, writing c. 178,[63] finds fault in Christian atheism,[64] yet his shot-gun blast hits Christianity on a multitude of counts. The charge of atheism receives no special emphasis but is just one of myriad attacks on moral, political and doctrinal grounds.

The evidence of our sources is consistent and overwhelming. Before the reign of Marcus Aurelius pagan hatred of the Christians was not caused primarily by the Christians' atheism.[65] Many sources mention or discuss hostile views and actions of the pagans towards the Christians (Clement's *1st Corinthians, The Ascension of Isaiah, Revelation*,

Symeon, Ignatius' and Telesphorus' martyrdoms, Quadratus' *Apology*, Trajan, Hadrian, Epictetus) and even suggest causes for this hostility (*1Peter, Acts*, Aristides' *Apology*, Ptolemaeus' and Lucius' martyrdoms, Suetonius, Tacitus, Pliny, Fronto). But only in the riot at Ephesus in *Acts* and in Justin Martyr is atheism depicted as playing a part. Yet as we have seen, at Ephesus economic interests were probably the primary consideration for Demetrius and his colleagues, and for Justin the charges of *flagitia* were more important than that of atheism. Atheism is much better attested for the reign of Marcus Aurelius. But atheism appears even then to have been only one of several disagreeable characteristics of the Christians in the eyes of many pagans. The baker's wife of the *Metamorphoses* (if Christian) is a cornucopia of vice. Marcus Aurelius mentions only Christian obstinacy. Lucian lists atheism unemphatically among other vices. Galen does not mention it at all. In our pagan sources it is not until the late 170s (Celsus, Lyon etc.) that atheism is clearly discernible as the chief concern of pagans.

2. *A Comparison with the Jews*

Comparison with pagan hostility to the Jews refutes any attempt to fault this evidence through arguments from likelihood or probability. Although the Jews too were atheistic from the pagan standpoint, atheism is not the outstanding trait which aroused pagan hatred. It is certainly noted by pagan writers (Elder Pliny, *Nat Hist* 13.46; Apion in Josephus, *c Ap* 2.65-7, 79; Apollonius of Molon in Josephus, *c Ap* 2.148), yet it is only one of many disagreeable traits. The Elder Pliny associates magic with Judaism as well (*Nat Hist* 30.11) and implicitly disapproves of Jewish rites and customs.[66] Apion charges the Jews with sedition (*c Ap* 2.68), ritual peculiarities and atrocities (2.80-102),[67] strange customs (circumcision, abstention from pork, 2.137), and misanthropy and separateness (2.96; 2.121-4). Apollonius of Molon charged the Jews with misanthropy (μισανθρώπους), cowardice (δειλίαν),[68] boldness (τόλμαν), insanity (ἀπόνοιαν), and stupidity (ἀφυεστάτους ... τῶν βαρβάρων, *c Ap* 2.148)[69] and considered Moses' νόμοι instructive of κακία and not ἀρετή (2.145). Josephus considered Apollonius' charge of separateness most worthy of a lengthy rebuttal (*c Ap* 2.258-78). Other writers express their distaste for Jews but mainly for reasons other than atheism.[70]

In fact, Graeco-Roman writers do not unanimously reject Jewish monotheism. Diodorus Siculus even compliments Moses on his wisdom and courage (φρονήσει τε καὶ ἀνδρείᾳ πολὺ διαφέρων) in the establishment of Jewish worship and political institutions, noting that the Jews have no images (40.3.3-4).[71] Revealingly, according to Strabo, it is not atheism but the late introduction of strange customs, such as abstinence from flesh, circumcision and excision, that marks the decline of Judaism into superstition (16.2.37).[72] Plutarch adduces the Jewish sabbath as an example of the perils of superstition (*de super* 8 [169C]), though the central theme of the essay is the contrast between superstition as an excess of religiosity and atheism as a dearth of it.

Tacitus' description of the Jews is the most instructive. The Jews' rejection of the gods is mentioned (*contemnere deos*), but only as part of a rhetorical triad ("exuere patriam," "parentes liberos fratres uilia habere") intended to show how thoroughly Jewish values are antithetical to those everyone else cherishes.[73] The Jews are noted to be monotheistic and to have no statues of the gods ("Iudaei mente sola unumque numen intellegunt," "profanos qui deum imagines mortalibus materiis in species hominum effingant; summum illud et aeternum neque imitabile neque interiturum. igitur nulla simulacra urbibus suis, nedum templis sistunt"), yet this observation is introduced largely for a tidy contrast with the Egyptians who worship many creatures and erect statues to them ("Aegyptii pleraque animalia effigiesque compositas uenerantur").[74] The Jews' refusal to worship kings and emperors is noted without value judgment ("non regibus haec adulatio, non Caesaribus honor"). Although Tacitus can describe these religious peculiarities with detached interest,[75] his disgust with other characteristics is unrestrained. Although he excuses their rites due to their antiquity ("ritus...antiquitate defenduntur"), they are *absurdi* and *sordidi*[76] when compared with those of Bacchus ("quippe Liber festos laetosque ritus posuit, Iudaeorum mos absurdus sordidusque").[77] Their other customs are depraved and disgraceful ("cetera instituta, sinistra foeda, prauitate ualuere"). Their missionary activity attracts the worst people, deserters of their proper religions ("nam pessimus quisque spretis religionibus patriis"). They are loyal to each other but hate outsiders[78] ("apud ipsos fides obstinata,[79] misericordia in promptu...sed aduersus omnis alios hostile odium"). They live apart in every respect and are sexual libertines ("separati epulis, discreti cubilibus, proiectissima ad libidinem gens, alienarum concubitu abstinent"). And, they are lawless ("inter se

nihil inlicitum," *Hist* 5.5). This flood of repulsive characteristics, manifestly the cause of Tacitus' disgust, overwhelms monotheism.

Therefore, though the atheists *par excellence* of antiquity, the Jews were not detested for their atheism—alienation of the pagan deities, disruption of the *pax deorum* and causing natural disasters. Pagans hated them for a complex of repugnant traits of which atheism was only one. It is no accident that these characteristics—strange rites, depraved customs, missionary activity, misanthropy, separateness, sexual excess, lawlessness, obstinacy—are for the most part identical to those which caused the Christians to be detested. Atheism, moreover, played a similar role in both cases: partly, to be sure, as a characteristic dangerous to man's relationship with the gods, but most important as yet another indication of the nettling separateness of both groups, of their insolent rejection of fundamental pagan values. To the pagan this separateness was virtually misanthropy and could be taken personally. Tacitus despised both the Jews ("adversus omnis alios hostile odium") and the Christians ("odium humani generis") for it.[80]

3. *Reasons for the Change*

Still, we are left with a problem. Discussing the hostile attitude of the Roman government towards Christianity, de Ste. Croix writes, "It is when we look at the behavior of the Roman government over the centuries...that we find reason to attribute a major role to the Christians' total rejection of the whole of Roman 'religio', summed up in the charge of 'atheism'. The onus is on those who deny the early importance of this long-lasting element to produce reasons why it should have arisen only after Pliny's day, when all we know of Roman religion would lead us to expect its appearance very soon after Christianity first attracted the attention of the government."[81] In that what official persecution there was was a response to popular charges, and in that the officials enforcing this response in our period shared with the community the same view of Christians (egs., Tacitus and Pliny), de Ste. Croix's challenge is valid for our theme as well. I am proposing three factors which taken together will explain why atheism, although only a minor source of pagan hostility in Christianity's first hundred years, later provided the field of confrontation.

First, ignorance. How much did the pagans know about Christianity in Pliny's time? According to our evidence, not much at all.[82] Pliny

evidently knew next to nothing not only about the sect but about his own government's policy towards the sect.[83] Tacitus had to inform his readers of the very basics. Trajan and Hadrian betray no knowledge. Even after 165, Lucian is obliged to provide his readers with rudimentary information (somewhat inaccurate, it must be noted) about the Christians. In the pogrom of Lyons in 177, the Roman governor seems to have known little of Christian beliefs (Eus., *HE* 5.1.31; 5.1.52).[84] If Justin Martyr is to be believed, Crescens did not really know much about Christianity (*2nd Apol* 3),[85] and according to Origen, Phlegon of Tralles had confused Jesus and Peter.[86] We find a long history of vague accusations of unspecified *flagitia*, in particular incest and ritual murder.[87] The latter charges, probably groundless for our period,[88] testify to incredible ignorance concerning Christianity. Writing in the second half of the second century, that is, more than a century after Christianity's inception, Fronto and Celsus (and possibly Apuleius) still bring these false moral charges against mainstream Christianity. Even if certain sects were practicing unusual forms of Christianity, the extent of ignorance among pagans is apparent in their inability to recognize the difference between mainstream and orgiastic Christianity, a difference about which almost any Christian would have been able to instruct—and with great feeling.[89] Lucian's derisive description of the Christians' courage, asceticism and simplicity (*de mor Per* 5) and Galen's admiration of the Christians' courage and continence,[90] both written in the second half of the second century as well, contrast sharply with the depictions of Fronto, Celsus and Apuleius.

Clearly there was a lack of accurate information concerning Christianity, and many pagans had not yet made the most fundamental distinctions about the Christians. But as the number of Christians grew and proselytization constantly brought Christianity to the attention of the pagan population, the Roman world became better acquainted with Christian beliefs and practices. Eventually everyone knew some Christians and apostates who could testify in word and deed to the falsehood of the scurrilous accusations.[91] Non-Christians would discover that exotic libertine sects (to the extent that they existed) formed a small minority and were execrated more by mainstream Christians than by the pagan community. The tenacity of these charges, current long after they ought to have been dispelled, testifies to their significance and to the power of our second factor: pagan hatred for the Christians.

In the first century of Christianity's existence a complex of character-

istics offensive and threatening to pagans had earned the Christians the enmity of many of their neighbors.[92] Not all of them hated Christians for the same reasons, but accusations of moral depravity provided all with a credible and satisfying way of expressing their loathing. Yet it was only a matter of time until the enemies of Christianity would have to abandon the morals charges as contact and familiarity eventually proved them absurd. Yet many other disturbing traits—disruption of families, separateness etc.—had a basis in fact and remained. These continued to fuel the fires of hatred, and hatred once engaged or learned does not yield without a fight. Thus when the most sensational and fear-inspiring charges were losing their credibility, hatred and suspicion proved their infinite ability to adjust to new circumstances and overcome objections. A new central cause of hatred was found—atheism—and it provided justification for prosecution. Hatred supplied the impetus and desire, increased knowledge the means of discovery. And providing the material was the true nature of Christianity, which was far more dangerous than the vast majority of pagans had realized: these detestable people were set upon undermining good relations with the gods and ultimately traditional worship itself. This charge, relatively insignificant and rarely attested for the first hundred years of Christianity, quite properly became pagans' chief weapon in the religious battles of the third century.

Finally, historical events may account for the emergence of atheism as a principal reason for pagan hatred in the reign of Marcus Aurelius. G. W. Bowersock has securely dated to 160/1 the earthquakes in Asia mentioned by Aristides.[93] This catastrophe, along with the great plague,[94] famine,[95] and foreign invasion, makes it easy to see how pagan awareness of and concern about Christian atheism must have increased as Marcus Aurelius' reign progressed. It has been inferred that these disasters caused an increase in prosecution of Christians by pagans and even anti-Christian rioting.[96] What has not been suggested, however, is that these catastrophes may have focused the attention of suffering pagans upon Christian atheism, hitherto largely ignored; further, that *for the first time* the already unpopular Christians were recognized by large groups of the population as dangerous. To pagans, divine displeasure was a likely cause of these unforseen disasters. Expiatory rites followed.[97] Many, who under normal circumstances could not have cared less about their neighbors' religiosity, would have found shocking and alarming the Christians' refusal to do their share in meeting the

emergency by supplicating the gods.[98] Distressed pagans who knew little of the cult looked into the reasons for this puzzling uncooperativeness. Those who were better acquainted with Christianity began to ponder the implications of Christian atheism. The religious exclusiveness of this bizarre cult soon became apparent to the ignorant and appalling to the indifferent. Perhaps some even thought that the cause of divine wrath and its concomitant disasters had been found—for the battered, frustrated pagan population of the empire (especially Asia), the Christians provided the perfect scapegoat.

The evidence for this period is difficult to date, but fits this interpretation. Only one reference from the 2nd century to Christian atheism can be attributed to the period before 160/1 with certainty, that of Justin Martyr's *1st Apology*. Otherwise: the Antoninus Pius/Marcus Aurelius rescript to Asia (whatever its origin) was written in the aftermath of the earthquakes of 160/1;[99] the date of Polycarp's martyrdom is as yet undetermined, though generally attributed to the early years of Marcus Aurelius;[100] it is uncertain whether Apuleius' Aemilianus was a Christian (see above, p. 260); and Crescens' assertions can be dated to anytime up to shortly before Justin's death (see above, 261). It is first under Marcus Aurelius that the charge of atheism comes to the fore. Justin's martyrdom (if Eusebius' assumption is correct, that Crescens, who had accused the Christians of being atheists,[101] was responsible for Justin's death [*HE* 4.16], it is likely that he employed the informal charge of atheism against the martyr) and Lucian's allusions to Christian atheism in the *de mor Per* (though of uncertain date) are to be attributed to the early years of his reign. In the emperor's late years Celsus' attack, the pogrom at Lyons, Athenagoras' *Supp pro Chr* (of 37 chapters, 27 are dedicated to the refutation of the allegation of atheism—for Athenagoras surely the most significant charge), and Tatian's *Or ad Gr*, ὡς ἀθεωτάτους ἡμᾶς ἐκηρύσσετε (27.1.30; although atheism is not a major concern) all occurred.

4. *Conclusion*

Early pagan contact with and impressions of Christians were by no means uniform. Widespread hostility towards Christians had many different causes and varied greatly in intensity. Attempts to attribute one overriding motive to the actions and attitudes of a large number of people of different occupations, social classes and environments—not

to mention personal dispositions—are bound to fail. Nor is it necessarily best to seek the most profound reason for pagan hatred. Some Americans who have never read *The Book of Mormon* and have virtually no knowledge[102] of Mormon theology nurse a powerful hostility towards the religion. Perceptions and impressions of Mormon abstemiousness, proselytizing, prosperity, self-righteousness, cliquishness, political conservativism, and bigamy arouse this animosity.[103] So too loathing of Christians is to be explained by a mélange of characteristics which irritated and affronted pagans, although many of Christianity's enemies had little knowledge of the new sect's message.

Since its emergence as a charge is demonstrably late, atheism is particularly ill-suited to explain early detestation of the Christians. In that our sources suggest other attributes of the Christians offensive to their pagan neighbors, there is no need to project atheism's effects back to a period for which they are virtually unattested. Pagan ignorance of Christianity, the psychology of hate and the disasters of Marcus Aurelius' reign, taken together, account for the pagans' initial disregard of Christian atheism and later concern about it.

NOTES

* I would like to thank M. Gwyn Morgan, Jerzy Linderski, Gayla McGlamery and Jeff Tatum for advice and suggestions. All errors and infelicities are my own.

[1] To be treated in a monograph by Gunther Gottlieb and myself.

[2] The standard work on the theme; A. Harnack, "Der Vorwurf des Atheismus in den drei ersten Jahrhunderten," *Texte und Untersuchungen* NF 13 (1905) 3-16.

The following will be referred to by author and short title: B. Altaner-A. Stuiber, *Patrologie* (Freiburg-Basel-Vienna 1966); T. D. Barnes, "Legislation against the Christians," *JRS* 58 (1968) 32-50, *Tertullian* (Oxford 1971); S. Benko, "Pagan Criticism of Christianity during the First Two Centuries A.D." *ANRW* 2.23.2, 1055-118, *Pagan Rome and the Early Christians* (Bloomington 1986); P. A. Brunt, "Marcus Aurelius and the Christians," in *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History*, ed. C. Deroux (Brussels 1979; Collection Latomus 164) 483-520; M. I. Finley, ed., *Studies in Ancient Society* (London-Boston 1974); R. Freudenberger, *Das Verhalten der römischen Behörden gegen die Christen im 2. Jahrhundert, dargestellt am Brief des Plinius an Trajan und den Reskripten Trajans und Hadrians* (Munich 1969, 2nd ed.); H. Fuchs, "Der Bericht über die Christen in den Annalen des Tacitus," in *Tacitus*, ed. V. Pöschl (Darmstadt 1969; orig. 1950) 558-604; J. Gerard, *Juvenal et la réalité contemporaine* (Paris 1976); D. Grodzynski, "Superstitio," *REA* 76 (1974) 36-60; J.-A. Hild, "Les Juifs à Rome devant l'opinion et dans la litérature," *REJ* 11 (1885) 11-59, 161-94; P. Keresztes, "The Imperial Roman Government and the Christian Church I. From Nero to the Severi," *ANRW*

2.23.1, 247-315; P. de Labriolle, *La réaction païenne. Étude sur la polémique antichrétienne du Ier au VIe siecle* (Paris 1934); J. Speigl, *Der römische Staat und die Christen* (Amsterdam 1970); M. Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism* I & II (Jerusalem 1976, 1980); A. Wlosok, "Die Rechtsgrundlagen der Christenverfolgungen der ersten Zwei Jahrhunderte," *Gymnasium* 66 (1959) 14-32.

[3] Even Plutarch (*de sup*) could compare superstition and atheism (with atheism getting the better of it 13[171B]-14[171E]; cf. H. A. Moellering, *Plutarch on Superstition* [Boston 1962; repr. 1963] 106-49) without discussing the ramifications of the latter for the community as a whole.

[4] See, among others, G. E. M. de Ste. Croix, "Why were the Early Christians Persecuted," in Finley, *Studies* (orig. 1963 in *P&P*) 238-42; it is well to give the sense which de Ste. Croix attributes to the term atheism since it is the sense used in this paper: "the monotheistic exclusiveness of the Christians was believed to alienate the goodwill of the gods, to endanger what the Romans called the 'pax deorum' (the right harmonious relationship between gods and men), and to be responsible for disasters which overtook the community. I shall call this exclusiveness, for convenience, by the name the Greeks gave to it, 'atheism' (ἀθεότης)" (238); see also Fergus Millar in his review of W. H. C. Frend, *Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church* (New York 1967), in *JRS* 56 (1966) 234; W. H. C. Frend, "The Persecutions: some Links between Judaism and the Early Church," *JEH* 9 (1958) 155 (note, however, that Frend is here discussing the attitude of the Roman government in particular); P. Keresztes, "The Emperor Hadrian's Rescript to Minucius Fundanus," *Phoenix* 21 (1967) 126-7; T. D. Barnes, "Legislation" 49-50, seems to suggest the same thing. Note, too, Brunt's discussion, "Marcus Aurelius" 512-5.

[5] As to the role of the *pax deorum* and the popular reaction to its violation, he claims, "at e contrario illis nomen factionis accommodandum est, qui in odium bonorum et proborum conspirant, qui aduersum sanguinem innocentium conclamant, praetexentes sane ad odii defensionem illam quoque uanitatem, quod existiment omnis publicae cladis, omnis popularis incommodi Christianos esse in causa" (*Apol* 40.1). Cf. eg. *Mart Polyc* 3.2, 9.2; *Ep Diogn* 2.5-7; Arnobius, *Ad nat* (see C. A. Contreras, "Christian Views of Paganism," *ANRW* 2.23.2, 1006-19); Eusebius, *HE* 5.1.9-10, 31 (on the Lyons massacre).

[6] A. N. Sherwin-White, "Why were the Early Christians Persecuted? An Amendment," in Finley, *Studies* (orig. 1964 in *P&P*) 250-1.

[7] See, too, 3.15-6.

[8] In *2nd Clement* 5.1-5, 20.1-3, we find possible allusions to persecution, but no discussion of cause.

[9] See L. H. Canfield, *The Early Persecutions of the Christians* (New York 1968; orig. 1913) 249.

[10] It is, moreover, the talk of the resurrection of the dead in Paul's address to the Areopagus, not any assault on the pagan gods, which created the sensation (17.32). See R. MacMullen, "Two Types of Conversion to Early Christianity," *VC* 37 (1983) 181-2, for discussion.

[11] Note that the rhetor Tertullus in his appeal to Felix only mentions στάσεις (*Acts* 24.5).

[12] On the economic aspect of this episode see especially E. Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums* III (Darmstadt 1962; orig. 1923) 118-28; W. Grundmann, "Paulus in Ephesus," *Helikon* 4 (1964) 66ff; R. Oster, "The Ephesian Artemis as an Opponent of Early Christianity," *JfAC* 19 (1976) 24-44, esp. 36-7; H.-J. Drexhage,

"Wirtschaft und Handel in den frühchristlichen Gemeinden," *Römische Quartalschrift* 76 (1981) 18ff. Economics played a role whether Demetrius was a smith or a warden of the temple or both (K. Lake-H. J. Cadbury, *The Beginnings of Christianity* 1.4, *The Acts of the Apostles* [London 1933] 245-6; Grundmann, p. 68, note 34).

[13] Melito in his *Apology* (Eusebius, *HE* 4.26.9) writes only of Nero and Domitian ἀναπεισθέντες ὑπό τινων βασκάνων ἀνθρώπων. Tertullian, *Apol* 5.3-4, 21.25, *Ad nat* 1.7, *De praesc haer* 36, *Scorp* 15; Eusebius, *HE* 2.1.1-5, 2.9.1-10.1, 2.22.1-23.24, 2.25.1-8, 3.1.2, 3.5.2, 3.17-20, *Chron* Olympiad 218; Sulpicius Severus 2.28-9.

[14] Barnes, *Tertullian* 150; cf. P. Keresztes, "Government" 257-72 (esp. 261-9 on Flavius Clemens and the two Domitillae; bibliography 261, notes 81-3, 267, note 99), whose conclusions, however, I find neither supported by any evidence nor psychologically plausible: "The non-Christian mobs zealously complied with Domitian's desire for Imperial worship. They demanded the punishment of the 'atheist' Christians, who abstained from the cult" (272); Speigl, *Staat* 22-7, on Cassius Dio and the case of Flavius Clemens and Domitilla, esp. 27.

[15] J. E. A. Crake, "Early Christians and Roman Law," *Phoenix* 19 (1965) 64-7.

[16] In Ignatius' letters and Eusebius' account of his death (*HE* 3.36) we find nothing about atheism. This holds for Rufus and Zosimus and 'others' as well (Eusebius, *HE* 3.36.13; Polycarp, *Ep Phil* 9). According to Hegesippus, Symeon was accused simply ὡς ὄντος ἀπὸ Δαυὶδ καὶ Χριστιανοῦ (in Eus., *HE* 3.32.3).

[17] Eusebius, *HE* 4.3.3, *Chron Olympiad* 226. For the texts, translations and commentary of the Syriac and Greek versions and a translation of the Armenian, see J. R. Harris-J. A. Robinson, *Texts and Studies* 1 (1891) 1-117; for a short bibliography see Altaner-Stuiber, *Patrologie* 65.

[18] Attack on pagan religion: Syriac 1-13; Greek 27.239-52 (*Barlaam and Joasaph*). Morality: Syriac 17. The Armenian fragments comprise only the beginning of the *Apology* and contribute nothing to our discussion.

[19] For the sources, date and the possibility that Telesphorus' martyrdom was not bloody, see Speigl, *Staat* 112-3.

[20] When Lucius protests the injustice of Ptolemaeus' sentence, he denies possible allegations of adultery etc., not atheism (τοῦ μήτε μοιχὸν μήτε πόρνον μήτε ἀνδροφόνον μήτε λωποδύτην μήτε ἅρπαγα μήτε ἁπλῶς ἀδίκημά τι πράξαντα ἐλεγχόμενον, ὀνόματος δὲ Χριστιανοῦ προσωνυμίαν ὁμολογοῦντα τὸν ἄνθρωπον τοῦτον ἐκολάσω).

[21] A date around or after 150 is generally accepted. See Altaner-Stuiber, *Patrologie* 66-7 (with bibliography).

[22] Brunt, "Marcus Aurelius" 519.

[23] Yet even here other elements complicate the picture: when Herod and Niketas tried to persuade Polycarp to sacrifice, Polycarp's typically irritating response to their concern caused them to maltreat him (*Mart Polyc* 8.2-3); the part the Jews, atheists themselves from the pagan point of view, may have played (12.2, 13.1, 18.1).

[24] The scope of this paper does not allow a discussion of the problem. From the extensive literature on the topic see especially: in support of the traditional date 155, P. Meinhold, *RE* 21.2 (1952), coll. 1673-8; for the late 150s, T. D. Barnes, "Pre-Decian *Acta Martyrum*," *JThS* 19 (1968) 510-4; following Eusebius, for the early years of Marcus Aurelius, H. v. Campenhausen, "Bearbeitungen und Interpolationen des Polycarpmartyrium," *Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akad. Phil.-hist.Kl.* 3 (1957) 1-48; cf. P.

Keresztes, "Government" 298-9 (for bibliography, 298-9, notes 277-81); for 168, W. Telfer, "The Date of the Martyrdom of Polycarp," *JThS* N.S. (1952) 79-83; for 177, see H. Gregoire and P. Orgels, "La véritable date du Martyre de S. Polycarpe (23, Février 177) et le Corpus Polycarpianum," *Anal Boll* 69 (1953) 1-38; prudently noncommittal, H. Musurillo, *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs* (Oxford 1972) xiii. For a recent discussion, D. Berwig, *Mark Aurel und die Christen* (diss. Munich 1970) 35-42.

[25] On *maleficus* = magician see P. de Labriolle, *La réaction païenne* 43-5; cf. M. Smith, *Jesus the Magician* (New York 1978) 174, whose stimulating conclusions concerning the passage and Tacitus' *odium humani generis* 650-3) are, I think, unconvincing.

[26] Its frequent use in Tacitus to denote sexual excess or perversion, including incest and adultery (*Ann* 2.85.6; 3.25.6, 34.25; 4.3.11, 6.2.2, 7.5, 40.18; 11.12.8, 25.24, 26.6, 32.15, 34.2; 12.64.9; 14.2.5 & 17, 15.10; 15.37.15; 16.19.12), murder (*Ann* 1.18.10; 3.13.6; 4.71.3; *Hist* 2.16.22; 3.51.11), treason (*Ann* 3.50.1, 60.8; *Hist* 4.57.18, 58.27, 72.13), and conduct unbecoming a Roman (*Ann* 14.14.17; 16.4.16), suggests many of the popular and official charges leveled against the Christians. Note especially pairings of such crimes which are apparently combined in the concept of *flagitium*: sedition and debauchery (*Ann* 4.14.13; 11.34.2); sedition, debauchery and astrology (*Ann* 3.23.9).

[27] Wlosok, "Rechtsgrundlagen" 22, translates *exitiabilis superstitio* as "entartete und sittenverderbende Fremdreligion."

[28] Wlosok, "Rechtsgrundlagen" 22, "Tacitus betrachtet und verwirft das Christentum ausschliesslich von moralpolitischen Gesichtspunkten, man kann auch sagen, aus der Sicht eines echt römischen Staatsmannes"; cf. J. Michelfeit, "Das 'Christenkapitel' des Tacitus," *Gymnasium* 73 (1966) 517-9.

[29] As seems probable: see H. Fuchs, "Bericht" 580-1, note 33.

[30] Cf. Fuchs, "Bericht" 578-84 (with bibliography).

[31] See E. Zeller, "Das odium generis humani der Christen," *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* 34 (1891) 356-67. The equation *genus humanum* = *imperium Romanum*, behind which H. Hommel ("Tacitus und die Christen," *Theologia Viatorum* 3 [1951] 10-30) and J. B. Bauer ("Tacitus und die Christen," *Gymnasium* 64 [1957] 501-2) see the imperial cult, is, I think, unconvincing (cf. contra, Michelfeit, [above, note 28] 518-26). Even so, conflict with the authorities over participation in the imperial cult neither implies atheism nor would it necessarily have provoked popular hatred.

[32] On knowledge of Christianity in general, see page 264-5.

[33] Unspecified misdeeds (*Pan* 28.1); delation (1.5.1) or participation in delation (9.13.16); administrative abuse and false accusation (6.22.2; see A. N. Sherwin-White, *The Letters of Pliny* [Oxford 1966] 382-3); deserting the worthy under dangerous circumstances, ie., a dishonorable deed entailing disgrace (1.5.5; 3.11.4); Regulus' forcing his way into wills (2.20.13).

[34] Probably already incest and cannibalism: cf. M. Dibelius, "Rom und die Christen im ersten Jahrhundert," (orig. 1942) in *Das frühe Christentum im römischen Staat*, ed. R. Klein (Darmstadt 1971) 83.

[35] In 6.17.3 (where Pliny criticizes people who go to readings but listen disinterestedly and hence alienate the reader) virtually 'stupidity'; in other passages, madness, frenzy or extreme foolishness.

[36] Elsewhere in Pliny *immodicus* always carries the central notion of 'excessive' or 'too' (2.14.10; 3.20.7; 5.6.14; 6.19.2; 7.9.16; 9.4.1, 12.2, 26.6; 10.104); and in a positive sense

of a favor (4.17.9), 'greater than hoped for.' This is true in Tacitus as well (*Ann* 4.18.7, 21.13; 15.23.14; *Hist* 1.35.2, 53.2, 69.8; 2.29.15; 3.53.2, 58.17).

[37] *Prauus* simply means 'base' in Pliny (3.9.32; 4.25.4; *Pan* 63.4; though 'small-minded' might be a better translation in 1.16.9). Pliny writes that Octavius Avitus poured oil on the friendly dolphin of Hippo *praua superstitione* (9.33.9). Here simply "through a base superstition" is meant—certainly no notion of atheism is intended.

[38] Pliny's other use of *contagio* (*Pan* 83.2; where he praises Trajan for keeping his private life and his family free from vice) is explicitly moral. In other authors *contagio* can indicate (in a simile or metaphor) "infection or pollution with an evil of any kind" (*OLD* s.v. *contagio* 2b). Revealingly, it is immediately after his account of Bacchanalian orgies, forgeries and ritual murders that Livy labels the conspiracy a *contagio* (39.9.1).

[39] Wlosok, "Rechtsgrundlagen" 27, note 38, considers *praua* and *immodica* to be "moralisch gefärbten Adjektive"; R. M. Grant, "Pliny and the Christians," *HTR* 41 (1948) 274, in suggesting the influence of Livy's narrative of the Bacchanalian conspiracy on Pliny's depiction of the Christians notes that "such charges are almost commonplace against obscure minority groups."

[40] See Sherwin-White, (above, note 33) 710.

[41] On extortion, see Tertullian, *ad Scap* 4. E. G. Hardy, *Christianity and the Roman Government* (London/New York 1894) 108, describes the atmosphere perfectly, "a spirit of terrorism in[to] the province."

[42] Contra, G. E. M. de Ste. Croix, "Why were the Early Christians Persecuted? A Rejoinder," in Finley, *Studies* (orig. 1964 in *P&P* 27) 258; A. Harnack, *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries* I (London 1908) 267.

[43] See *OLD* s.v. *superstitio* 1; cf. Grodzynski, "Superstitio," 38-40, 52-5; Freudenberger, *Verhalten* 194-7.

[44] Varro in Augustine, *de civ Dei* 6.9; Seneca, *de clem* 2.5.1. Examples: Suetonius, *Dom* 15.3; Tacitus, *Hist* 2.4. See Grodzynski, "Superstitio" 40-3; Speigl, *Staat* 71, "was die Grenze der geforderten Religion überschreitet"; cf. Godo Lieberg, "Die römische Religion bei Minucius Felix," *RhM* 106 (1963) 63; Freudenberger, *Verhalten* 189-91. Note too Plutarch, *de sup* 6(167D)-14(171F), for whom superstition and atheism are the two opposite extremes between which religion offers a proper mean (though δεισιδαιμονία and *superstitio* are not identical terms, there are significant points of contact from the 2nd century AD on: see S. Calderone, "Superstitio" *ANRW* 1.2, 377-84; Moellering [above, note 3] 53-60).

[45] *OLD* s.v. *superstitio*. Cf. I. Pfaff, "Superstitio," *RE* II 4 (1932) col. 937; Freudenberger, *Verhalten* 191-2.

[46] Livy 4.50; Tacitus, *Ann* 11.15, 13.32; *Ger* 43, 45; Quintilian, *Inst* 4.4.5; for Druidism, Tacitus, *Hist* 4.54; for Isis worship, Suetonius, *Dom* 1.2; Egyptians called *dedita superstitionibus gens* (Tacitus, *Hist* 4.81.1; cf. 1.11.1, on Egypt, "prouinciam...superstitione ac lasciuia discordem et mobilem"—in that Tacitus is here referring to the province as a whole and designates Tiberius Alexander an Egyptian [Stern, *Authors* II 8], he is clearly not referring exclusively to Jewish/Greek unrest); cf. "externas caerimonias, Aegyptios Iudaicosque ritus compescuit, coactis qui superstitione ea tenebantur religiosas uestes cum instrumento omni comburere" (Suetonius, *Tib* 36), where *superstitione ea* refers to Isis worship (see Stern, *Authors* II, 113, for discussion and bibliography). See esp. Freudenberger, *Verhalten* 192-4; cf. Grodzynski, "Superstitio"

44-52, who however argues that *superstitio* means "religion des autres," (44), only after 100 AD (44-7).

[47] Grodzynski, "Superstitio" 43, 48. It is, moreover, evident from Cicero, *Pro Fl* 28.67, where Cicero in praising resistence *barbarae superstitioni* is speaking of pressure exerted by assembled Jews and not Judaism itself, that *superstitio* can refer to the adherents of the cult as well as to the cult itself.

[48] The Elder Pliny's statement, "aliud uero est castimoniarum superstitioni etiam sacris Iudaeis dicatum" (*Nat Hist* 31.95), suggests entirely different associations.

[49] The genuineness and integrity of the text (which the author will address in another paper) are assumed here.

[50] *Diss* 4.7.6; see S. Benko, "Criticism" 1077, bibliography, 1115. *Diss* 2.9.19-21 refers to Jews, not Christians (Stern, *Authors* I 543-4).

[51] There is no agreement among scholars concerning the authenticity of this document. Some consider it mostly genuine, H. E. Stier, *RAC* I, coll. 479-80; some, partially genuine and claim to be able to distinguish the genuine from the corrupt sections, A. Harnack, "Das Edikt des Antoninus Pius," *Texte und Untersuchungen* 13 (1895) 35-7 (contra, W. Hüttl, *Antoninus Pius* I [Prague 1936] 207-11, note 351), L. Saltet, "L'édit d'Antonin," *Rev d'hist et de littér relig* (1896) 385, R. Freudenberger, "Christenreskript. Ein umstrittenes Reskript des Antoninus Pius," *ZfK* 78 (1967) 1-14, P. Keresztes, "Antoninus Pius," *JEH* 22 (1971) 13-7; some, a complete forgery, W. Schmid, "The Christian Reinterpretation of the Rescript of Hadrian," *Maia* 7 (1955) 10-4, H. Moreau, *Die Christenverfolgung im Römischen Reich* (Berlin 1961) 47, E. J. Bickerman, "Trajan Hadrian and the Christians," *Riv de fil e di istruzione clas* 96 (1968) 292; others prudently consider the recovery of a genuine text, if there was one, a hopeless task, T. D. Barnes, "Legislation" 37-8, *Tertullian* 154-5.

[52] If genuine, the confusion over the ascription of the letter (to Antoninus Pius between 10 Dec. 160 and 7 March 161 by Justin [*Cod Par Gr* 450]; to Antoninus Pius by Eusebius as well [*HE* 4.12], but the letter he produces is addressed by Marcus Aurelius [*HE* 4.13], ἐντευχθεὶς δὲ καὶ ὑφ' ἑτέρων ὁ αὐτὸς βασιλεὺς [sc. Antoninus Pius] ἐπὶ τῆς 'Ασίας ἀδελφῶν, παντοίαις ὕβρεσιν πρὸς τῶν ἐπιχωρίων δήμων καταπονουμένων, τοιαύτης ἠξίωσε τὸ κοινὸν τῆς 'Ασίας διατάξεως· Αὐτοκράτωρ Καῖσαρ Μάρκος Αὐρήλιος 'Αντωνῖνος Σεβαστός, 'Αρμένιος, ἀρχιερεὺς μέγιστος, δημαρχικῆς ἐξουσίας τὸ πέμπτον καὶ δέκατον, ὕπατος τὸ τρίτον, τῷ κοινῷ τῆς 'Ασίας χαίρειν, whose titulature gives us a date between 7 March 161 and 10 Dec. 161) still renders a date c 160-1 most probable (see especially Barnes, "Legislation" 37-8, *Tertullian* 154-5). The earthquakes refered to are probably those of 160-1 (see below, note 93). For possible *termini post* (164, based on the title Armenicus) and *ante quam* (176, based on Melito's reference, Eusebius, *HE* 4.26) see Barnes, "Legislation" 38, who assumes that the letter is a forgery.

[53] We can only be certain that the speech was written before 167 (see E. Champlin, *Fronto and Antonine Rome* [Cambridge, Mass. 1980] 139-42), despite a number of plausible attempts to be more precise and to define a context (eg. Champlin, *Fronto* 64-6; for bibliography see Benko, "Criticism" 1081, note 95 and pages 1115-6; Champlin, *Fronto* 160, notes 18-21).

[54] A. Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius* (2nd ed., Leipzig 1958) 105. P. Keresztes, for example, attributes the *2nd Apology* to Marcus Aurelius' reign, anytime before Justin's death ("The 'So-Called' Second Apology of Justin,"

Latomus 24 [1965] 867-9). On Crescens and Justin, see Berwig, (above, note 24) 26-8.

[55] Aelius Aristides' attack ('Υπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων 663-87 [Lenz/Behr]) on an unnamed "philosophy" is excluded here because it is most likely a comparison of cynics to Jews and does not involve Christians at all (L. Früchtel, *RAC* I, 654-5; contra, de Labriolle, *La réaction païenne*, with discussion, 80-7). Even if we identify either the philosophers or the Palestinians as Christians, there is no explicit reference to atheism (τοῖς ἐν τῇ Παλαιστίνῃ δυσσεβέσι...καὶ γὰρ ἐκείνοις τοῦτ' ἐστὶ σύμβολον τῆς δυσσεβείας ὅτι τοὺς κρείττους οὐ νομίζουσι [671] could, however, suggest atheism), although many other distasteful traits are listed.

[56] See H. v. Thiel, *Der Eselroman* I (Zetemata 541 [1971]) 36-7, note 92.

[57] See esp. L. Herrmann, "L'Âne d'or et le christianisme," *Latomus* 12 (1953) 189-91; further, Benko, "Criticism" 1090, and Stern, *Authors* II, 201. For bibliography, Benko, "Criticism" 1116, Stern, *Authors* II, 201-2, notes 1-7.

[58] Marcus Aurelius himself mentions Christians just once, and there complains only of their unreasoned obstinacy (*Meditations* 11.3). Brunt, "Marcus Aurelius," 483-98, argues, unconvincingly I think, that the passage in question is a gloss. However, his arguments against supposed allusions to Christianity elsewhere in the *Meditations* are sound.

[59] Gilbert Bagnani, "Peregrinus Proteus and the Christians," *Historia* 4 (1955) 108.

[60] Yet see A. D. Simpson, "Epicureans, Christians, Atheists in the Second Century," *TAPA* 72 (1941) 372-81, on other reasons to associate Christians with Epicureans.

[61] R. Walzer, *RAC* VIII, col. 780.

[62] For discussion of Galen's attitude towards Christians and Jews and translations of the Arabic fragments, see R. Walzer, *Galen on Jews and Christians* (London 1949); cf. Benko, "Criticism" 1098-100, *Pagan Rome* 140-7; R. Wilken, *The Christians as the Romans Saw Them* (New Haven 1984) 72-93.

[63] P. Merlan, *RAC* II, col. 954; see H. Chadwick, *Origen: Contra Celsum* (Cambridge 1980; orig. 1953) xxvi-xxviii, for discussion of the evidence (bibliography in footnotes).

[64] Wilken (above, note 62) 96-7; for a summary and discussion of the criticisms see Benko, "Criticism" 1101-8, *Pagan Rome* 147-58.

[65] The *Ep Diogn* mentions atheism, but the date is unknown (Altaner-Stuiber, *Patrologie* 135-6, with bibliography).

[66] *Nat Hist* 31.95, "aliud uero est castimoniarum superstitioni etiam sacris Iudaeis dicatum, quod fit e piscibus squama carentibus." Hild, "Juifs" 165, argues apropos of Pliny's observation of Judaic atheism, "gens contumelia numinum insignis" (*Nat Hist* 13.46: which in Stern's judgement "has an undisputably anti-Semitic ring" [*Authors* I, 495]), "en interprétant ces idées de Pline sur la religion juive par ses convictions philosophiques, on serait tenté d'y voir un éloge plutôt qu'une critique" (165), and suggests that Pliny's distaste of Judaism was limited to its ritual and custom (164-6).

[67] The precise provenance of this material, Posidonius, Apollonius or elsewhere, is not the issue here. For discussion and bibliography see Stern, *Authors* I, 389-416.

[68] Referring to the sabbath? See L. Troiani, *Commento Storico al "Contro Apione" di Giuseppe* (Pisa 1977) 179.

[69] Galen criticizes Jewish reliance on untested doctrines (*de puls dif* 2.4) and unwillingness to learn (*de puls dif* 3.3).

[70] Only a few examples: Cicero, *pro Fl* 28.69; Juvenal 6.159-60, 14.98-104; Dio 37.17.2; Antiochus Sidetes' advisers in Diodorus Siculus, fragments of Bks 34 and 35 in Photius,

Bibl p. 379B, 1.4, 40.3.4; Persius 5.179-84; Habinnas in Petronius 68.8; Martial 7.30,35,82, 11.94; the Alexandrians in Philo, *Em Gai* 26.170; Damocritus in *Suda* s.v. Δαμόκριτος; Suetonius, *Claud* 25; Posidonius in Strabo 16.2.43; Lucian, *Tragodopodagra* 173; Florus, *Ep* 1.40.30; Seneca in Augustine, *de civ Dei* 6.10.

[71] The statement that the Jews were expelled from Egypt ὡς ἀσεβεῖς καὶ μισουμένους ὑπὸ τῶν θεῶν (fragments of Bks. 34 and 35 in Photius, *Bibl* 379B 1.1) is the opinion of Antiochus Sidetes' advisors, not Diodorus' or his source's (see Stern, *Authors* I, 183-4, note 1). It does not necessarily imply atheism anyway.

[72] On the "Begeisterung" of the Strabo passage for Mosaic Judaism see J. Morr, "Die Landeskunde von Palästina bei Strabon und Josephus," *Philologus* 81 (1926) 259-66; cf. Hild, "Juifs" 40-1. On the problems of interpretation and source criticism see Stern, *Authors* II, 261-5, bibliography, 7-8. Note too: according to Augustine (*de civ Dei* 4.31), in arguing for his own form of monotheism Varro offered the Jews as a positive example of a race without images. Strabo writes that Moses' monotheism appealed to thoughtful men (16.2.36), depicts him very much like a philosopher (16.2.35), and calls his successors θεοσεβεῖς (16.2.37). Varro also commends the Jews for worshipping without images (in Augustine, *de civ Dei* 4.31); cf. *de sublimitate* 9.9, ὁ τῶν Ἰουδαίων θεσμοθέτης, οὐχ ὁ τυχὼν ἀνήρ, ἐπειδὴ τὴν τοῦ θείου δύναμιν κατὰ τὴν ἀξίαν ἐχώρησε κἀξέφηνεν. See Calderone (above, note 44) 383-4.

[73] This 'triad' does not even correspond to what Tacitus claims about the Jews elsewhere: see Hild, "Juifs" 179.

[74] Elsewhere Tacitus notes that the Jews set up a statue of an animal (5.4, "effigiem animalis...penetrali sacrauere [sc. Iudaei]") and sacrificed. For a discussion of the inconsistency see Stern, *Authors* II, 37. Tacitus may simply be trying to have it both ways to make the Jews seem as outlandish as possible. The intention was not so much to give an accurate description of the Jews as a striking one.

[75] Stern, *Authors* II, 2. H. J. Leon, *The Jews of Ancient Rome* (Philadelphia 1960) 41, even detects "a touch of admiration for their supreme, unrepresentable Deity and for their stubborn refusal to set up images of kings or of the Caesars."

[76] "aberwitzig und widerwärtig," according to H. Heubner-W. Fauth, *P. Cornelius Tacitus. Die Historien* V (Heidelberg 1982) 87.

[77] Cf. *Ann* 2.85.4-5, "ceteri cederent Italia, nisi certam ante diem profanos ritus exuissent." Judaism is labeled a *superstitio* in the passage, but it is the *profanos ritus* which must be abandoned. Dio (57.18.5a) attributes the expulsion to the success of Jewish proselytizing; Josephus to a case of fraud (*Ant* 18.81-3).

[78] On Jewish misanthropy and separateness in Tacitus see B. Wardy, "Jewish Religion in Pagan Literature during the Late Republic and Early Empire," *ANRW* 2.19.1, 621-4; cf. Heubner-Fauth, 64-6, with bibliography (see above, note 76).

[79] Cf. *Hist* 2.4.3, where *peruicaciam superstitionis* is noted as an obstacle to Vespasian's conquest of Jerusalem. Jewish obstinacy, however noble, only irritated the Romans, "augebat iras, quod soli Iudaei non cessissent" (*Hist* 5.10.2). Resistance to Roman authority tended to be viewed by the Romans as a moral flaw.

[80] Fuchs, "Bericht," 582-4, derives the Christians' reputation for *odium humani generis* from their Jewish origins.

[81] Page 260 (above, note 42).

[82] See Brunt, "Marcus Aurelius," 503-6, especially for the western part of the empire

in Marcus Aurelius' time; cf. MacMullen, (above, note 10) 177; *Christianizing the Roman Empire (A.D. 100-400)* (New Haven 1984) 20; A. Giovannini, "Tacite, l'"incendium Neronis" et les chrétiens," *Revue des Études Augustiniennes* 30 (1984) 3-4. It is important to keep in mind that the number of Christians in the empire in the earliest period was very small (see R. M. Grant, *Early Christianity and Society* [San Francisco 1977] 1-7). Many pagans would not have even had the opportunity to meet a Christian!

[83] Contra, Keresztes, "Government" 276-87, whose arguments, however, are based more on likelihood than on what Pliny actually says or any external evidence; in a similar vein, Speigl, *Staat* 62-5.

[84] See Frend, *Martyrdom* 11 (above, note 4).

[85] See de Labriolle, *La réaction païenne*, 63-5.

[86] *FGRHIST* II, 257, fr. 16e.

[87] The reference to harmless food makes most sense if Pliny had heard rumors of ritual murder and cannibalism (see F. J. Dölger, "Sacramentum infanticidii," *Antike und Christentum* 4 [1934] 195-6).

[88] See especially R. Freudenberger, "Der Vorwurf ritueller Verbrechen," *ThZ* 23 (1967) 97-107; A. Henrichs, "Pagan Ritual and the Alleged Crimes of the Early Christians," *Kyriakon. Festschrift Johannes Quasten* (Munster, Westphalia 1970) 18-35; contra, W. Speyer, "Zu den Vorwürfen der Heiden gegen die Christen," *JfAC* 6 (1963) 129-35; Benko, "Criticism" 1081-9 (esp. 1086-9), *Pagan Rome* 54-78 (79-102 on the holy kiss); R. L. Wilken, "Toward a Social Interpretation of Early Christian Apologetics," *Church History* 39 (1970) 442; cf. F. J. Dölger's fundamental discussion (above, note 87) 188-228.

[89] This is not the place to discuss the value of the accusations of ritual atrocities leveled against libertine Gnostics (for the essential bibliography see above, note 88). Speyer, (above, note 88) 134-5, rightly suggests that we can hardly expect pagans to have been clear about which Christians were orthodox and which heretical. Yet this is the point. Although 'orthodox' Christianity was already distancing itself from libertine Gnosticism in the second half of the second century (Henrichs [above, note 88] 28-9), pagan ignorance (even from an in-depth researcher like Celsus) was such that we do not expect pagans to be aware of even this crisis in the church.

[90] See Walzer (above, note 62) 15.

[91] As in Pliny's experience. See T. Mommsen, "Der Religionsfrevel nach römischen Recht," *Gesammelte Schriften* III (Berlin 1907; orig. 1890) 393.

[92] See above, note 1.

[93] "The Proconsulate of Albus," *HSCP* 72 (1968) 289-94.

[94] The effects of which, however, should not be exaggerated: see J. F. Gilliam, "The Plague under Marcus Aurelius," *AJP* 82 (1961) 225-51.

[95] See D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* (Princeton 1975; orig. 1950) 663, 1533-4, notes 8-9.

[96] Moreau (above, note 51) 50; P. Keresztes, "Marcus Aurelius a Persecutor?" *HTR* 61 (1968) 321-40.

[97] See Keresztes (above, note 96) 321-40, who argues for an "Imperial edict of about 167 AD ordering sacrifices to the gods for the whole of the Empire to win their help in the tragic situation caused by the devastating plague and possibly the threat of the German war" (340; cf. "Government" 299-303). This is not the place to address the issue. For our purposes let it suffice that an imperial edict is not essential to explain the emergence of atheism as a charge against the Christians.

[98] See Keresztes (above, note 96) 331-2, on the psychological state of the pagan population (though I do not agree with every detail of his analysis).

[99] Barnes, "Legislation" 38; Keresztes, "Government" 296.

[100] See above, note 24.

[101] On Eusebius' assertion, see Barnes (above, note 24) 516-7; but see too de Labriolle, *La réaction païenne* 63-5.

[102] Although many Mormons have attained fame in a variety of fields—politics, sports, popular music, etc.—few Americans know anything of their religious convictions. How less likely that in an age of primitive communications and rare literacy pagans would have been versed in the doctrines of a relatively unimportant, low-profile cult like Christianity!

[103] Arthur Conan Doyle's *A Study in Scarlet*, with its often inaccurate but luridly entertaining depiction of Mormonism, is a telling though dated example.

Loyola College, 4501 North Charles Street, *Baltimore*, Maryland 21210-2699, U.S.A.

Vigiliae Christianae 45 (1991), 278-285, E. J. Brill, Leiden

ORIGEN'S USE OF XENOCRATES OF EPHESUS

BY

ALAN SCOTT

Xenocrates of Ephesus (first century A.D.) was the author of one of the Hellenistic era's standard lapidaries, the *Lithognomon*.[1] He was certainly used by Origen in one passage, and probably was used by him in two others. Moreover, Xenocrates is quoted in a passage of Jerome which earlier scholars suspected was taken from a work of Origen's that is no longer extant, and further examination strengthens that conjecture. These passages are a test case for Origen's attitude toward Hellenistic learning, in which he rejects certain scientific approaches which he feels are incompatible with Christian teaching, but adopts others without hesitation to serve what he viewed as the central intellectual task, the interpretation of scripture.

Origen cites Xenocrates by name in his exegesis of Psalm 118(119):26, but the passage has come down in a very complex form. In 1884 Pitra edited an incomplete version of Origen's text together with Ambrose's commentary on the same verse, which clearly was a paraphrase.[2] The following year Bücheler noted how close Origen's comments were to a number of passages in Pliny's *Natural History*, showing that Xenocrates was the source for some anonymous material in Pliny.[3] In 1935 Max Wellmann reprinted Pitra's text and its parallel in Ambrose alongside these sections and others of Pliny.[4] A short time later, in 1937, René Cadiou took an important step by editing a longer recension of Origen's remarks.[5] This recension, however, has been transmitted in a more corrupt form than the short recension in the *catenae*. Therefore when Cadiou edited the longer version of the text he included extensive references to the *catena* and to Ambrose in the critical apparatus. The text of the *catena* has been recently edited by Robert Devreesse[6] and by Marguerite Harl.[7] The following description is based on the longer recension edited by Cadiou.

In order to explicate the word τοπάζιον ("I have loved your Law more than gold and *topaz*"), Origen refers to what has been recorded in

Xenocrates' *Lithognomon.* The stone is found near a city in the Thebaïd called Alabastron and is called "alabaster" from the place which produces it.[8] But some say there is an island called Topaz. A group of Troglodytai[9] was shipwrecked there, and spent a long time on the island since they did not know how to build boats. Here they came upon the stone and were delighted by its color. They brought many with them when they returned home. Arab merchants purchased them, and they say that Philo bought the stones from them and took them to Bernice, the mother of the king, Ptolemy II,[10] who purchased many of them. It is a mixture of two colors, leek-green and gold, like chrysoprase, and quite intense.[11] It is fiery, very pure, and larger than any chrysoprase, and sparkles like the sun. Because of its abundance it is not as much sought after as formerly. When polished it becomes abrasive, and decreases in size when used. It is an easy stone to carve.

Bücheler noted that a comparison of Pliny's *Natural History* 37.109 with Origen shows that when Pliny says he follows "the most recent authorities" in his description of topaz he was referring to Xenocrates, whom elsewhere he described as still living (i.e. in 77 A.D.).[12] Wellmann refined Bücheler's thesis, not only attempting to identify Xenocrates' views but speculating on the degree to which Xenocrates had followed or differed with earlier authorities, especially Juba.[13]

Origen also mentions precious stones in a second passage where Xenocrates is not named but is probably the source. In his commentary on Matthew 13:45, "the kingdom of heaven is like a merchant in search of fine pearls," Origen discusses different types of far-off pearls written up "in those who write on the subject of stones" (παρὰ τοῖς περὶ λίθων πραγματευσαμένοις).[14] Origen's unnamed source divides pearls into land and sea varieties. Land pearls and the best of the sea pearls are Indian. Origen reports that Indian sea pearls form herds with a single leader, the way that a hive is commanded by a queen bee: in fact, if this leader is captured, the other follow in a docile manner. We are told that the quality of the pearl is affected by dew and by lightning; the color, quality and location of various pearls are discussed in some detail.

Wellmann noted parallels in this text to Pliny and Aelian.[15] His theory was that Pliny and Origen were each independently using Xenocrates, and that Aelian's work was based on Juba. Since Xenocrates (here as in the description of topaz) had used Juba as a source,[16] parallels of Origen with Aelian again bore witness to Xenocrates' text. The material on pearls shared between Origen and

Pliny was so striking that in 1948 it caught the attention of Werner Jaeger, who, without seeing Wellmann, came to the conclusion that Origen had used Xenocrates. Jaeger then used Pliny's text to emend the critical text of Origen's account.[17]

Wellmann's and Jaeger's proposal that this passage followed Xenocrates was based on the fact that Xenocrates was named as a source by Origen in his work on Psalm 118, and the parallels between that passage and Pliny were matched by similar parallels with Pliny here in the Matthew commentary. The current authority on Xenocrates, Manfred Ullmann, regards Wellmann's and Jaeger's view as probable but not certain.[18] Another argument to further their case (admittedly not decisive) is that the high regard for Indian pearls in Origen's source is matched by an equally high regard for Indian adamas in a fragment of Xenocrates preserved by Jerome and Pliny.[19]

Another type of difficulty is presented by the passage in Jerome's *Commentary on Amos* just mentioned, where Jerome explicitly is following (perhaps quoting) Xenocrates. He describes the stone adamas (ἀδάμας), which is harder than hammer and anvil. Xenocrates has seen adamas the size of a millet that had been set in gold and outlasted its setting,[20] and he claims that it will break a file. Adamas, however, is dissolved by the blood of he-goats, and placed in hot blood it loses its strength.[21] Xenocrates gives its size and color, and says it is found in four regions, India, Arabia, Macedonia, and Cyprus, having greater or lesser hardness according to region. It is also said to draw away poisons like amber, and to resist the black arts[22]—the last a concern also found in the recently published Arabic fragments of Xenocrates.[23]

The fact that Origen specifically cites Xenocrates in his discussion of Psalm 118 and that Jerome's commentaries frequently use Origen's scholarship was enough to convince Wellmann that Jerome here must be following Origen.[24] The standard investigations of Jerome's sources (apparently without seeing Wellmann's book) are undecided on whom he has used for this information, and the most recent treatment of this question again judges Wellmann's view as probable but not certain.[25] There is, however, additional reason to think Jerome is here following a lost work of Origen. In one of Origen's homilies on Jeremiah, extant in Jerome's Latin translation, there is a very similar passage. Again commenting on Amos 7:7, Origen reports that adamas is stronger than the hammer that strikes it. If the devil is the hammer of Jeremiah 27:23 (LXX) above, and the dragon is as it were the "invincible anvil" of Job

41:16 (LXX) below, then the saint is "a wall of adamas" or "adamas in the LORD's hand" (Amos 7:7 LXX) who does not worry about the hammer or anvil but is made stronger by their blows. Origen continues:

> It is said that those who are busy with sales of stones, when they wish to test adamas, are unsure if it is adamas or not so long as it has not come to the hammer and anvil. However, they then are persuaded it is the truest adamas if the stone remains intact between the hammer and anvil, if the harder nature of the stone pricks [them] when struck from above by the hammer and below by the anvil.[26]

This sounds like Xenocrates' remark that

> When it is put on an anvil and struck with a heavy blow of a hammer, anvil and hammer receive damage before the adamas is chipped.[27]

It would appear that Origen read the same passage of Xenocrates which Jerome cites, and rather than suggesting that Jerome has read Xenocrates independently, it is much more likely that he has copied remarks from Origen's lost commentary on Amos.

The passages from Origen's commentaries on Psalm 118 and on Matthew, and from Jerome's (Origen's) commentary on Amos are included in Wellmann's and Ullmann's collections of witnesses to the *Lithognomon*.[28] A passage not yet noted in which Origen has probably used Xenocrates in his discussion of the eagle stone (ἀετίτης), which eagles bring to their nest to keep their young safe.[29] Wellmann knows the passage but assumes that Origen is getting his information from Celsus (who, Wellmann suggests, is following Juba),[30] and to my knowledge no one else has speculated on the source of this passage since then. In the portion of the text where Origen clearly is quoting Celsus, he does refer to how eagles know "the powers of certain stones to keep their young from harm," so that this derivation was not unreasonable.[31] Celsus scholars, however, do not regard the passage which specifically discusses the eagle stone as derived from him.[32]

Comparison with the Arabic fragments of Xenocrates shows that it is likely that here too Origen is using the *Lithognomon*. There is a striking parallel between an Arabic citation of Xenocrates and Origen in the description of how eagles use this stone to protect their nests: the Arabic fragment states that

> Die Adler bringen den Stein in ihre Nester zum Schutze ihrer Jungen (trans. Ullmann),

while Origen writes

> Ὡς εἰ καὶ ἀετοὶ πρὸς σωτηρίαν τῶν ἐν τῇ καλίᾳ νεοσσῶν τὸν λεγόμενον ἀετίτην λίθον εὑρόντες φέρουσιν ἐπ' αὐτήν...[33]

In this passage Origen, by introducing the subject of the eagle stone, demonstrates that he is well-informed about a topic Celsus has raised. Here (as often in the *Contra Celsum*) he has gathered information from another source as part of his response, and once again it is probable that this source was Xenocrates.

Eusebius reports that Origen wrote three of the works discussed in this paper—his lost commentary on the twelve prophets (which according to Jerome included six books on Amos), the *Contra Celsum*, and his commentary on Matthew—at about the same time: after he was 60 years old and before the reign of Decius, i.e. between 245-249.[34] Harl notes it is not possible to date Origen's work on an individual psalm such as Psalm 118 with any precision, but she gives reasons for thinking it is a late composition; perhaps, following Nautin, it was written between 246-248.[35] Origen's homilies on Jeremiah appear to have been written somewhat earlier, probably between 240-244.[36] Evidently Xenocrates'*Lithognomon* was a volume in Origen's library at Caesarea.

Wellmann notes that in the Hellenistic era mineralogy was regarded principally as a source of pharmacology,[37] and this pharmacology was heavily informed by magical literature. This aspect of Xenocrates' work has been confirmed by the Arabic witnesses to Xenocrates. In addition to precise descriptions of stones (in the tradition of Theophrastus) and colorful traveler's tales, Xenocrates set forth at length the marvelous qualities of various stones as pharmaceuticals and prophylactics. He regarded topaz, for example, as a protection against elephantiasis when engraved and worn on the ring finger on the left hand (frag. 14 Ullmann), and the eagle stone as a great aid to women in childbirth (frag. 1). Such qualities were an important feature of all Xenocrates' entries; we are told that jasper (ἴασπις) when placed beneath the sleeper's head prevents bad dreams (frag. 12), that five drachmas of blood stone (αἱματίτης) with radish-oil breaks up stones in the bladder (frag. 3), and that the gem hyacinth (ὑάκινθος) when put in the mouth protects against poisoned wine (frag. 8), etc. It is striking that, with the one exception of the passage in Jerome on adamas, these qualities are not mentioned in Origen's work, though a good deal of other extraneous information is passed on. Even in the Jerome passage the pharmaceutical properties

of the stone are handed along only briefly and in a noncommittal way. One of the major purposes of Xenocrates' work was therefore passed over almost in silence by Origen.

This was not because Origen was hostile to medical literature in general: it appears that he read several treatises of Galen,[38] and scattered throughout his works are references to various aspects of the medical profession.[39] It is likely rather that this type of material was simply too close for comfort to magic, which Origen strongly opposed.[40] The boundary between magic and medicine was of course unclear in this era, but Xenocrates certainly was indebted to a tradition of medicine in which the two were particularly close,[41] and material of this sort was handled very carefully by Origen. Just as Origen adopted even quite sophisticated astronomical teachings (such as the precession of the equinoxes) but not the astrological lore that accompanied them,[42] so too he could regard much of Xenocrates' information as useful, even when it was quite fantastic, so long as it stayed within the realm of what might be called natural history: the physical description of gems and stones, their location, and their properties. On the other hand, it would appear that pharmacology, which was usually regarded as one of the most important features of a lapidary, was not quite safe for a Christian theologian at this point, even one as bold as Origen.

NOTES

[1] Karl-Willy Wirbelauer, *Antike Lapidarien* (Wuerzburg: K. Triltsch, 1937) 14; Manfred Ullmann, *Die Natur- und Geheimwissenschaften im Islam*, HdO 6.2 (Leiden: Brill, 1972) 98. The identification of the author of the *Lithognomon* with Xenocrates of Aphrodisias (standard in the older literature) is doubted by the most recent investigators, see Fr. Kudlien, "Xenokrates aus Aphrodisias," *PW* 9a.2 (1967) 1531.

[2] Joannes Baptista Card. Pitra, *Analecta Sacra* (1884, repr. Greggs Press, 1966) 2:341-3, published under the heading of "Seniores Alexandrini." As Pitra notes, in 1845 Angelo Mai quoted the same passage (where it was treated as anonymous) in a footnote to Cyril's commentary on the Psalms (*Novae Patrum Bibl.* 3:433 = PG 69,1271).

[3] Franz Bücheler, "Zwei Gewährsmänner des Plinius," *RhM* 40 (1885) 304-7 (= *Kleine Schriften* 3:63-6).

[4] Wellmann, *Die Stein- und Gemmenbücher der Antike*, Quellen und Studien zur Gesch. der Naturwiss. 4.4 (Berlin: Julius Springer, 1935) 89f. Wellmann accidentally attributes Ambrose's passage to Jerome, a mistake repeated by Wirbelauer, *Lapidarien* 15.

[5] "L'ile Topaze, fragment de Xénocrate d'Éphèse," *Mélanges Desrousseaux* (Paris: Librairie Hachette, 1937) 27-33.

[6] *Les anciens commentateurs grecs des Psaumes*, SeT 264 (Vatican City: Vatican Library, 1970) 67f.

[7] *La chaîne palestinienne sur le Psaume 118*, SC 189 (Paris: du Cerf, 1972) 390-5.

[8] Following Cadiou's conjecture; cf. R. Pietschmann, "Alabastron," *PW* 1 (1893) 1272.

[9] More accurately: Trogodytai. See further K. Jahn, "Trogodytai," *PW* 7a.2 (1948) 2497-500. For the island Topaz cf. Alexander Polyhistor, *FGrH* 273 F 136.

[10] The *catena* adds: "under whom the holy scripture was translated." Pliny (= Juba, *FGrH* 275 F 75) says Philo was a praefect.

[11] Harl notes (SC 190,712-3) that by its description it is not the same stone as what we call topaz. This is regularly true of this stone and many others whose names are still used in modern mineralogy, see D. E. Eichholz in the LCL edn. of Pliny's *Natural History* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard, 1962) vol. 10 p. ix. For convenience I refer to τοπάζιον as "topaz."

[12] Pliny 37.37; "Gewährsmänner" 306.

[13] *Stein* 93f.

[14] *In Matth* 10.7 (SC 162,162,12*sqq.*).

[15] *Stein* 90-3.

[16] *FGrH* 275 F 70f., cf. Jacoby's note.

[17] "Studia Pliniana et Ambrosiana," *Scripta Minora* (Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Lettera, 1960) 2:389-94.

[18] "Xenokrates," *PW* Suppl. 14 (1974) 974-7.

[19] *In Amos* 3.7 (CCSL 76,319,221), Pliny 37.56. The lack of originality typical in lapidaries (evident in Xenocrates' own use of Juba) leaves open the possibility that this information could have come down to Origen from another source.

[20] Cf. Manilius 4.926: "sic adamas, punctum lapidis, pretiosior auro est."

[21] The parallel in Pliny 37.59 makes Xenocrates' meaning clearer: the goat's blood *must* be fresh and hot if it is to dissolve the adamas. The legend of their antipathy may have had its origins in astrology, see A. A. Barb, "Lapis Adamas," *Hommages à Marcel Renard*, Coll. Lat. 101 (Brussels: 1969) 1:80 n. 3.

[22] *In Amos* 3.7 (CCSL 76,318f.). Once again there are parallels in Pliny: Wellmann, *Stein* 88f.

[23] Xenocrates fragments 7 and 10 (Ullmann). The same is later said of adamas in Damigeron-Evax 3.1 (238 ed. Halleux/Schamp, in their valuable *Les Lapidaires Grecs* [Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1985]). The Arabic fragments are published (with translation) by Manfred Ullmann, "Das Steinbuch des Xenokrates von Ephesos," *Medizinhistorisches Journal* 7 (1972) 49-64 (fragments 1-8), and "Neues zum Steinbuch des Xenokrates," *ibid.* 8 (1973) 59-76 (fragments 9-16). As Ullmann notes (vol. 8, p. 74) it is uncertain if the passages are quotations, adaptations, or paraphrases.

[24] Wellmann, *Der Physiologos*, Philol. Suppl. 22 (Leipzig: Dieterich, 1931) 85 n. 226, and *Stein* 88. Jerome certainly had access to Origen's exegesis of this passage since he owned a copy of Origen's commentary on the Twelve Prophets, see *De Vir. Ill.* 75 (TU 14.1,41,8-11).

[25] See Christel Meier, *Gemma Spiritalis*, Münstersche Mittelalter-Schriften 34.1 (Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1977) 91 n. 290. Adriaen (in CCSL 76 *ad loc.*) and Meier include references to scholarship on Jerome.

[26] *In Jer.* Latin Hom. 1.1 (SC 238,304,40-7).

[27] *In Amos* 3.7 (CCSL 76,319,208-10), cf. Pliny 37.60.

[28] Wellmann *Stein* 88-93; Ullmann *PW* Suppl. 14,974.

[29] *CCel.* 4.86 (SC 136,398). Parallels in Wellmann *Physiologos* 90 n. 243, and K. Schneider/E. Stemplinger, "Adlerstein" *RAC* 1 (1950) 94.

[30] *Stein* 128f. n. 5.

[31] *CCel.* 4.86 (trans. Chadwick). Furthermore, Origen does know many miraculous stories about animals through Celsus: 4.81-5 (lore on bees and ants), 4.98 (elephants, storks, the phoenix), 4.57 (spontaneous generation of various animals—following Celsus according to Chadwick).

[32] Robert Bader, *Der* ΑΛΗΘΗΣ ΛΟΓΟΣ *des Kelsos*, TBAW 33 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1940) 124 n. 4; also Glöckner, Chadwick, Borret

[33] Xenocrates frag. 1 (Ullmann), Origen *CCel.* 4.86 (SC 136,398). The Arabic fragment has a parallel in Pliny *N.H.* 36.149-51, cf. Ullmann *PW* Suppl. 14,975, and already Wellmann *Physiologos* 88f.

[34] *H.E.* 6.36.2 (GCS 9.2,590,18-22).

[35] SC 189,154f. n. 1 (Harl cites Nautin).

[36] So Pierre Nautin in SC 232,15-21.

[37] *Stein* 86.

[38] R. Grant, "Paul, Galen, and Origen," *JThS* 34 (1983) 533-6.

[39] E.g. his reference to the treatments physicians attempted before resorting to surgery, *In Jesu Nave* Hom. 7.6 (SC 71,212).

[40] Gustave Bardy, "Origène et la Magie," *RechScRel* 18 (1928) 126-42.

[41] For the main representatives of this tradition (the best known of whom is Bolos) see Wellmann, "Die ΦΥΣΙΚΑ des Bolos Demokritos und der Magier Anaxailaos aus Larissa," *Abhandl. der preuss. Akad. der Wiss.*, phil.-hist. Kl. 7 (1928) 1f., and Ullmann *Natur* 394.

[42] See Éric Junod, *Origène: Philocalie 21-27*, SC 226 (Paris: du Cerf, 1976) 191-3 (equinoxes), 47-65 (versus astrology).

East Lyme, CT 06333, U.S.A.

Vigiliae Christianae 45 (1991), 286-292, E. J. Brill, Leiden

THE DATE OF THE TRANSLATION OF THE RELICS OF SS. LUKE AND ANDREW TO CONSTANTINOPLE.

BY

DAVID WOODS

There would seem to exist among scholars at the moment an almost universal acceptance that the translation of the relics of Luke and Andrew to the Church of the Holy Apostles in Constantinople took place in AD357.[1] In so far as there has been discussion of this matter there has been a concentration on resolving the conflict of evidence between those sources which date the translation to the reign of Constantine, specifically AD336, and those sources which date it to the reign of Constantius.[2] However it would seem to have escaped general notice that there are in fact two traditions which attribute the translation of these relics to the reign of Constantius, and that these differ in the years of translation which they propose.

The first tradition which dates the translation of the relics to AD357 can be traced back as far as the *Chronicle* of Jerome which was composed at Constantinople in AD379/80. This work enjoyed great success and clearly influenced the *Descriptio Consulum* of Hydatius (cAD468), the *Consularia Constantinopolitana*, and the *Chronicon Paschale* (cAD630), all of which also chose AD357 as the year of translation. However whereas the *Chronicle* of Jerome gave only the year they also stated the month and day of the translation, March 3rd, in agreement with yet another source in this matter, the *Ecclesiastical History* of Theodorus Lector (cAD530), which gave the month and day but not the year.[3] Thus March 3rd AD357 became the accepted date of the translation of these relics within mainstream historical thought.

The second tradition concerning the date of translation has been preserved by only one text, the *Passio Artemii* of John of Rhodes. However this text does not present us with the required date by straightforwardly naming the consuls or stating the year of the emperor's reign in which the translation occurred. It merely states the sequence of events within which the translation occurred. Yet the information provided is of such

a quality that by comparing it with what we know from other sources the date of the translation quickly emerges.

The *Passio Artemii* states that after a campaign on the Danube from his base at Sirmium Constantius gave the order concerning the translation of the relics to a certain Artemius whilst he was at Adrianopolis.[4] On the completion of this task, it states, Artemius was created Dux Aegypti at the request of the bishops.[5] All the elements of this story can be closely dated. Firstly there is the campaign on the Danube. This is clearly identifiable as the campaign of spring AD359 against the Limigantes, described in some detail by Ammianus.[6] Next we must consider the presence of Constantius at Adrianopolis. Apart from the common sense assumption that Constantius would naturally pass through this town as it was on the main route from Sirmium to Constantinople, and he was in a hurry to Constantinople according to Ammianus, we must also consider a letter which Constantius addressed to the bishops who were meeting at Ariminum during the latter half of AD359.[7] This stated that he would meet their delegates on his return to Adrianopolis and that these should wait there for him. Not only does this letter prove that Constantius was at Adrianopolis in the latter half of AD359 but it also allows us to establish a terminus ante quem for his presence there. Those same delegates to which it refers were to finally come to agreement on the matter to which they had wanted to draw the emperor's attention at Nice on October 10th of the same year.[8] Thus Constantius had passed through Adrianopolis sometime before October 10th AD359, several weeks beforehand probably.[9] Finally, then, there is the matter of Artemius and his appointment as Dux Aegypti. The earliest evidence we have for his possession of this post dates to February 11th AD360 and attests his presence in Egypt by this date also.[10] There is no further evidence as to the date of his appointment other than to note this post was still held by Sebastianus on December 24th AD358.[11] Thus it is entirely possible that Artemius was appointed Dux Aegypti as a result of his role in the translation of the relics of Luke and Andrew to Constantinople. There existed a period of about four months, between October AD359 and February AD360, during which there was time for him to have transported the relics from Achaia to Constantinople, and to have continued his journey on down to Egypt. If an allowance is made for the length of time it took to travel to Egypt it becomes clear that the relics must have arrived in Constantinople sometime during the last two months of AD359.

In this manner it can be seen that in its account of the translation of the relics the *Passio Artemii* provides a fairly detailed description of events which is perfectly consistent with what we otherwise known of the history of this period. This is clearly not just a matter of a late pious fiction. Indeed the author, John of Rhodes, is quite specific in attributing what he has said about the roles of Constantius and Artemius in the translation to the *Ecclesiastical History* of Philostorgius.[12] Unfortunately we do not possess this history in full but only an epitome of it made by Photius in the ninth century. However the similarity between the relevant passages, *Passio Artemii 17* and *Epit.III.2.* makes it clear that the claim of John of Rhodes in this matter is completely trustworthy. Thus we have two conflicting traditions about the date of the translation of the relics, that represented by Jerome and that represented by Philostorgius. Superficially these traditions would seem to be of equal merit in that the authors were almost exact contemporaries of each other and were both familiar with Constantinople itself. However in so far as Jerome did not himself provide the exact date of the translation of the relics, March 3rd, the date which was used by later authors as already mentioned, and Philostorgius does not seem to have done so either, it becomes clear that there must have been a third source for this information. Accepting that this is the real date of the translation of the relics to the Church of the Holy Apostles, based perhaps on the knowledge of an annual commemoration of the translation on this date, how do we reconcile this with the tradition represented by Philostorgius, that the relics arrived at Constantinople in the last months of AD359? There is apparently a contradiction here which ought to incline us to Jerome's dating.

My first point is that there is a distinction to be made between the translation of the relics to Constantinople and the translation proper of the relics to their final resting place, the Church of the Holy Apostles. It was the latter alone which was commemorated by annual celebration afterwards. Whilst a delay of several days between the arrival of relics in a city and their translation proper is understandable in our particular case we would seem to be dealing with a delay of at least two months.[13] This delay would seem to merit special explanation, and such an explanation is indeed possible. It must be remembered that it would have been the Bishop of Constantinople who would have presided at the translation ceremony proper of the relics to the Church of the Holy Apostles. Until his deposition by the synod of Constantinople which

opened in January of AD360 this had been Macedonius. However his deposition had less to do with his doctrinal differences with his fellow bishops than with the hostility of the emperor. He had incurred Constantius' wrath partly by his removal of the body of Constantine from its original resting place to the Church of St. Acacius, and partly by the severe riots and bloodshed which his policies were then arousing.[14] Thus Macedonius was in disgrace by the time of the arrival of Constantius himself at Constantinople late in AD359. It is hardly likely that Constantius would have allowed such a man to preside at so important an occasion as the translation proper of the relics of Luke and Andrew. He would have waited until the bishops had gathered and duly elected a new Bishop of Constantinople. The exact date of the election of the new bishop, Eudoxius, formerly of Antioch, is not known but the *Chronicon Paschale* states that it occurred only a few days before he presided at the dedication of the Church of St. Sophia on February 15th. It is probable therefore that he was only elected during the second week of February. Thus the delay between the arrival of the relics in Constantinople and their translation proper can be almost entirely accounted for, and in the context the delay between the second week of February and March 3rd does not seem excessive. Noteworthy also considering the emphasis on Constantius' role in the translation of the relics to Constantinople is the fact that his presence there is still attested by March 14th.[15] Thus he would have been able to attend personally the ceremony of translation proper.

In this manner it has been shown that far from contradicting the tradition represented by Philostorgius that source which provides the date March 3rd lends additional support to it. Yet whilst the weight of the evidence would now seem to support Philostorgius there must be still some doubt in our minds unless we can account for Jerome's assertion that the year in question was AD357. This we can also do.

We are fortunate in that Jerome twice specifically dates the translation of the relics, firstly in his *Chronicle* and later in his *De Viris Illustribus* (cAD392).[16] On this second occasion he dates it to the "*vicesimo Constantii anno*". If one considers such a phrase it is apparent that it can be interpreted in several different ways. The first and most natural assumption is that it refers to the twentieth year since Constantius' accession to the rank of Augustus, twenty years since AD337, i.e. AD357. However if we remember that this phrase is being used in a particular context, in reference to Constantinople, then a

second date emerges. Constantinople had only been gained by Constantius from his brother Constans in AD340 as a result of the civil war which had then broken out between Constantine II in the West and Constans.[17] Thus as far as Constantinople itself was concerned the twentieth year of Constantius' reign was AD360, not AD357. It is possible that in the matter of the translation of these relics Jerome misunderstood in this fashion a source which referred to the twentieth year of Constantius' occupation of Constantinople and not to his twentieth year as Augustus. Such a mistake would have been all the more easy in that the consuls for years AD357 and AD360 were both the same, Constantius and Julian in each case.[18]

At this point something ought also to be said about the translation of the relics of St. Timothy from Ephesus to Constantinople. According to Jerome and those later chroniclers who follwed him in the matter of the relics of Luke and Andrew this occurred in AD356, the year before the translation of the relics of Luke and Andrew. However the *Passio Artemii* and Photius' epitome of Philostorgius' history would seem to suggest the contrary. In their accounts of the translation of the relics of Luke and Andrew mention is only made of the translation of the relics of Timothy at the very end, and in a way which suggests this occurred last.[19] As far as the day and month of this translation is concerned there is some disagreement in our sources but July 1st would seem to be the preferable date.[20] It is reasonable to suggest, therefore, that the translation of the relics of Timothy occurred on July 1st AD360. This is too late for Artemius to have been involved in anyway. Yet although the *Passio Artemii* does make such an assertion is should be noted that it does so only in a passage which is obviously the original work of its author, John of Rhodes.[21] In that passage which is derived from Philostorgius' history it says only that Constantius moved the relics from Ephesus. It is possible that John of Rhodes has in this matter made an assumption which was not justified by the text of Philostorgius which he had before him.

To conclude, the *Passio Artemii* of John of Rhodes has alone preserved the true account of the translation of the relics of Luke and Andrew. Sometime before October 10th AD359 and whilst still at Adrianopolis Constantius ordered Artemius to proceed to Achaia and to transport the relics there to Constantinople. On his arrival in Constantinople later in the same year Artemius was appointed as Dux Aegypti and left immediately to take up his post in Egypt. He failed to

attend the translation proper of the relics to the Church of the Holy Apostles because this ceremony was delayed as the result of a rift between Constantius and the Bishop of Constantinople, Macedonius. It only took place on March 3rd AD360 shortly after the election of Eudoxius to replace Macedonius.

NOTES

[1] Some of the more noteworthy examples of the acceptance of this date are as follows: O. Seeck, *Regesten der Kaiser und Päpste* (Stuttgart, 1919); H. Delehaye, *Les Origines du Culte des Martyrs* (Brussels, 1912), p. 66, and the *Propylaeum Ad Acta Sanctorum Decembris* (Brussels, 1940), p. 181; G. Downey, The Builder of the Original Church of the Apostles At Constantinople, *DOP* 6, 1951, pp. 72-73; A.H.M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1964), p. 960; J. Dummer, Fl. Artemius dux Aegypti, *Archiv für Papyrusforschung 21*, 1971, p. 143; R. Krautheimer, *Three Christian Capitals: Topography and Politics* (Berkeley, 1983), p. 80; M. Whitby, *Chronicon Paschale 284-628 AD* (Liverpool, 1989), p. 33.

[2] Paulinus of Nola, *Carm.* 19.329-41, and three of the consular lists (*Vind. pr., Vind. post., Scal.*) refer the translation to Constantine I.

[3] *HE.*II.61.

[4] *Passio Artemii* 16.

[5] *Passio Artemii* 18.

[6] Amm.19.11.1-16.

[7] Amm.19.11.1-17; for the letter, Ath. *De Synodis* 55, Socr. *HE.*II.37.

[8] Hilary, *Fragm.* 8.5.

[9] The orthodox delegates only signed the agreement of October 10th after a long wait, in vain, for the reception which Constantius had promised in his letter. So Hilary implies by his description of them as "*longa dilatione fatigati*", *Fragm.* 8.4.

[10] *P.Oxy.* 1103.

[11] *Hist.Aceph.*6.

[12] *Passio Artemii* 17. His actual words, "The historian says such things about Constantius and the martyr", allow of no other meaning in the light of his statements in *Passio Artemii* 4 about the enthusiasm of Philostorgius for Artemius, and have been interpreted in this sense by J. Bidez in his edition of the text, *Philostorgius Kirchengeschichte* (Leipzig, 1913), p. 31.

[13] There was, for example, a delay of two days in Milan in AD386 between the discovery of the relics of Gervasius and Protasius in the Church of SS. Nabor and Felix and their translation to the new Ambrosian Basilica. See F.H. Dudden, *The Life and Times of St. Ambrose* (Oxford, 1935), p. 300.

[14] Socr. *HE.*II.38: Soz.*HE.*IV.21.

[15] *C.Th.*7.4.5.

[16] *De Vir.*III.7.

[17] T.D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius* (Harvard, 1981), p. 262, states that Constantius possessed the diocese of Thrace, and therefore Constantinople, since AD337, using as his sources Eus.*VC* 4.51.1, *Passio Artemii* 8, Zonaras 13.5. However Eus.*VC* 4.51.1

does not actually support such a claim. On the basis of *Epit. de Caes.*41.19, Zos.2.39, and, most importantly, the numismatic evidence J.P. Kent, *Roman Imperial Coinage* VIII (London, 1981), p. 426 argues that Thrace and Constantinople only came into the possession of Constantius in AD340.

[18] R.S. Bagnall et al., *CLRE*, pp. 248-49; pp. 254-55.

[19] *Passio Artemii* 17: Philos.III.2.

[20] Hydatius has June 1st, *the Consularia Constantinopolitana* and the *Chronicon Paschale* July 1st, whilst Theodorus Lector has June 24th (*HE.II.61*). However the date usually accepted is July 1st as, for example, by Downey, op. cit., p. 72.

[21] *Passio Artemii* 9.

Dominic St., *Mullingar*, Co. Westmeath, Eire

Vigiliae Christianae 45 (1991), 293-310, E. J. Brill, Leiden

REVIEWS

Origenes, *Commentarii in Epistulam ad Romanos* L. I et II/*Römerbriefkommentar* Buch 1 und 2. Übersetzt und eingeleitet von Theresia Heither OSB (Fontes Christiani 2/1). Herder, Freiburg u.s.w., 1990. 358 S. DM. 53,—.

Die Reihe »Fontes Christiani«, deren zweiter Band hier vorliegt, bietet zweisprachige Neuausgaben christlicher Quellentexte aus Altertum und Mittelalter. Origenes' Kommentar zum Römerbrief ist, abgesehen von einigen Fragmenten, nur in Rufins Übersetzung überliefert. Dieser Band enthält den Text Rufins mit deutscher Übersetzung der ersten zwei Bücher. In einer Einleitung erörtert die Verfasserin die Frage, ob die Übersetzung Rufins die Gedanken des Origenes getreu wiedergibt, zumal er selbst ausdrücklich sagt, dass er kürzen und zusammenfassen will. Sie beantwortet diese Frage bestätigend, und dies m.E. mit Recht. Sie skizziert auch die Grundgedanken des Origenes und zeigt, wie wichtig dieser oft unterschätzte Kommentar ist, z.B. wegen der Art und Weise in der über die Beziehung zwischen Juden und Christen gesprochen wird. »In der Sicht der Origenes«, so sagt sie, »ist das Grundproblem des Paulus die Übertragung, *translatio*, der einen Religion« (S. 28; vgl. den Titel ihres Buches, *Translatio Religionis*, Köln 1990).

Bekanntlich hat der Römerbrief in der Geschichte des Christentums eine grosse Rolle gespielt. Über das Evangelium, das Paulus darin verkündet, ist unterschiedlich geurteilt worden, wie auch über seine Rezeption in der frühen Kirche. (Siehe jetzt das Sammelwerk *Paul and the Legacies of Paul* ed. by W.S. Babcock, Southern Methodist University Press Dallas, 1990). »Der Römerbriefkommentar des Origenes ist ein wesentliches Dokument für das Paulusverständnis der Alten Kirche, wenn er auch nur wenig Nachwirkung gehabt hat« (S. 10).

Der lateinische Text ist der *Patrologia Graeca*, Band 14, von Migne entlehnt und ist sehr akkurat abgedrückt worden. An zwei Stellen im Buch 2,14 ist jedoch *et si* in *etsi* geändert worden, was nicht richtig ist (*sed et si quis* = *sed etiam omnis, qui*), wie auch die Übersetzung zeigt.

Die Übersetzung ist im allgemeinen sehr gut. Zwei kleine Bemerkungen: Im Exkurs über die Beschneidung (S. 262,25) sagt Origenes bezüglich Gen. 17, 9-14, dass *in aliis exemplaribus non habetur positum octava die*

in hoc dumtaxat loco. Die Übersetzung lautet: »dass in anderen Manuskripten gerade an dieser Stelle nichts vom achten Tag steht«. Das ist jedoch nicht die Bedeutung von *dumtaxat*. M. E. sagt Origenes, dass »in anderen Manuskripten die Worte 'am achten Tag' fehlen, *wenigstens an dieser Stelle*«. Er zitiert unmittelbar eine andere Stelle (Lev. 12, 1-4), wo sie offensichtlich sehr wohl zu finden sind. Am Ende desselben Exkurses sagt Origenes, dass er *post excessum iusto forsitan longiorem* zum Text zurückkehrt. Dies bedeutet nicht »nach diesem mit Recht ausführlichen Exkurs« sondern »nach diesem vielleicht zu langen Exkurs«.

Es ist die Absicht der Verfasserin, zunächst die Arbeit am lateinischen Text (Bücher 3-10) fortzusetzen und dann in einem eigenen Band die verschiedenen griechischen Fragmente zu bearbeiten.

Die hohe Qualität dieses ersten Bandes zeigt, dass das Werk in guten Händen ist. Die äussere Form des Buches ist sehr ansprechend.

2312 GD *Leiden*, Haarlemmerstraat 106B J. C. M. VAN WINDEN

Ambrosius, *De Sacramentis/De Mysteriis. Über die Sakramente/Über die Mysterien*. Übersetzt und eingeleitet von Josef Schmitz CSSR (Fontes Christiani 3). Herder, Freiburg u.s.w., 1990. 279 S.

Dieser dritte Band der Reihe "Fontes Christiani", in der christliche Quellentexte aus Altertum und Mittelalter in zweisprachiger Neuausgabe ediert werden, enthält zwei Werke, die von hohem liturgiegeschichtlichem und dogmenhistorischem Wert sind. Inhaltlich stimmen sie grossenteils überein; in formaler Hinsicht, d.h. in Syntax, Stil und Gedankenführung gibt es erhebliche Unterschiede. Man hat sogar bezüglich *De Sacramentis* die Verfasserschaft des Ambrosius bestritten. Der Verf. meint, dass die Differenzen sich aus der unterschiedlichen Gattung der beiden Werke erklären. *De Sacramentis* wäre die unbearbeitete Mitschrift von Taufkatechesen die Ambrosius in einer bestimmten Osterwoche für Neugetaufte gehalten hat, *De Mysteriis* ein schriftstellerisches Zeugnis. (Eine derartige These wurde schon von F. Probst, *Die Liturgie des vierten Jahrhunderts und deren Reform* (Münster 1893) verteidigt).

In der Einleitung bietet der Verf. eine klare Darstellung des reichen Inhalts der beiden Werke und zeigt damit, wie sich die christliche Initia-

tion (Taufe und Taufeucharistie) in Ambrosius' Zeit in Mailand vollzog.

Der lateinische Text ist ein Abdruck des von O. Faller in CSEL edierten Textes und ist mit einem kritischen Apparat versehen. Die Übersetzung ist im allgemeinen genau und deutlich, mit Ausnahme von einigen Stellen, die der Verbesserung bedürfen.

Sacr. 2,14 *nobis autem iam fidei praerogativa defertur* wird mit »uns aber wird schon ein Hinweis auf den Glauben geboten« übersetzt. *Praerogativa* bedeutet jedoch nicht 'Hinweis' sondern 'Privileg' oder 'Vorrecht', also 'das Vorrecht des Glaubens'.

Sacr. 5,19 sagt Ambrosius zu den Neugetauften, dass sie durch die Gnade Christi von einem schlechten Knecht zu einem guten Sohn geworden sind, und fährt dann fort: *Ideo praesume non de operatione tua sed de gratia Christi.* Nachdem er dann gesagt hat, dass es keine *arrogantia* sondern *fides*, keine *superbia* sondern *devotio* ist, Gott seinen Vater zu nennen, fügt er hinzu: *Bona praesumptio, sed moderata.* Die Übersetzung lautet: »eine gute Hoffnung, aber eine zurückhaltende«. *Praesumptio* bedeutet jedoch etwas anderes. Man spricht von *praesumptio*, wenn jemand sich etwas besonderes zueignet, und meistens hat das Wort einen pejorativen Sinn: 'Einbildung'. Deshalb sagt Ambrosius ausdrücklich, dass es sich hier um eine gute *praesumptio* handelt. Vielleicht könnte man *praesumptio* hier mit 'Stolz' übersetzen. (Auch der Imperativ *praesume* am Anfang dieses Abschnittes sollte dementsprechend übersetzt werden).

Sacr. 1,24 ... *satis sit hodie etiam de sacro fonte libasse mysteria.* Die Übersetzung lautet: »... haben wir ... für heute schon genug Mysterien aus dem heiligen Brunnen ergossen«. Hier hat der Verf. das Verb *libare* m.E. nicht richtig verstanden. *Libare* bedeutet nicht ohne weiteres 'ergiessen', sondern '*ein wenig* (vom Wein) als Opfer spenden', und weiterhin 'ein wenig wegnehmen', 'leicht berühren' und in dieser letzten Bedeutung wird das Verb hier verwendet. Ambrosius sagt, dass es für heute genüge (neben anderen Dingen) *auch* (etiam) *die Mysterien bezüglich des heiligen Brunnens berührt zu haben.* Er fügt hinzu: »Morgen werde ich, wenn der Herr es gibt, darüber ausführlicher handeln«, und am Anfang der dritten Katechese sagt er: *Hesterno de fonte disputavimus.* »Gestern haben wir über den Taufbrunnen gesprochen«. In der ersten Katechese hatte er diese Sache *nur berührt.*

Sacr. 2,11: Warum der Satz *Vides ergo, quod in cruce Christi omnium hominum levatur infirmitas* mit einem Fragezeichen versehen wird, leuchtet mir nicht ein.

Sacr. 1,5: Ambrosius erinnert die Neugetauften an das wiederholte '*abrenuntio*' beim Taufrituell, und sagt: *Memor esto sermonis tui, et numquam tibi excidat tuae series cautionis.* »Sei dir deiner Erklärung bewusst, und niemals entfalle dir die Konsequenz *der Verpflichtungen, die du eingegangen bist*«. Durch die Übersetzung 'Verpflichtungen, die du eingegangen bist' geht die präzise Bedeutung von *cautio* verloren. *Cautio* ist eine schriftliche oder mündliche Garantie oder Sicherstellung, und soll dementsprechend übersetzt werden.

Ambrosius vergleicht dann den Neugetauften mit jemandem der eine schriftliche Garantie, d.h. einen Schuldschein, abgegeben hat, und sagt: *Si chirographum homini dederis, teneris obnoxius, ut pecuniam eius accipias.* Die Übersetzung lautet: »Wenn du jemandem einen Schuldschein gegeben hast, bist du gehalten, sein Geld anzunehmen«. Das wäre eine merkwürdige Aussage; alsob es sich bei einem Schuldschein um die Verpflichtung handelte, Geld anzunehmen. Ambrosius sagt jedoch Folgendes: »du bist eine Verpflichtung eingegangen (und bist also gebunden), *damit* du sein Geld empfängst«.

Sacr. 1,6 sagt Ambrosius: wo die himmlischen Sakramente sind, sind auch die Engel anwesend. Mit 'Engel' deutet er hier die Spender der Sakramente an, wie aus der folgenden Erklärung hervorgeht: *Quia et homines angeli, quicumque adnuntiant Christum et in angelorum adscisci videntur locum.* Der Verf. setzt ein Komma nach *angeli* und übersetzt: »Weil auch Menschen Engel sind, da sie Christus verkündigen und den Platz der Engel eingenommen zu haben scheinen«. Das ist wiederum eine merkwürdige Aussage. Sind diese Menschen Engel, *da* sie den Platz der Engel eingenommen zu haben scheinen? Was Ambrosius sagt ist m.E. Folgendes: »Denn es gibt auch Menschen die Engel sind, nämlich diejenigen, die Christus verkündigen, *und sie* scheinen des Platzes der Engel teilhaft zu werden«. (Letzteres wird von Ambrosius aufgrund der vorangehenden Aussage hinzugefügt, dass der Schuldschein, der vom Leviten (= Engel) angenommen wird, nicht auf der Erde, sondern im Himmel aufbewahrt wird). Man sollte also *videntur* nicht auf eine Linie mit *adnuntiant* stellen, und auch *quicumque* nicht kausal auffassen. Auch was der Verf. Ambrosius sagen lässt, nämlich dass die Menschen »den Platz der Engel eingenommen zu haben scheinen«, könnte missverstanden werden. Die Menschen treten nicht an die Stelle der Engel, sondern werden dort wo die Engel sind, aufgenommen.

Myst. 3 *Aperite igitur aures et bonum odorem vitae aeternae inhalatum vobis munere sacramentorum carpite. Quod vobis significavimus,*

cum apertionis celebrantes mysterium diceremus »effetha, quod est adaperire« ... Bezüglich dieser Worte sagt der Verf. in der Einleitung: »Aus dem Zusammenhang geht nicht hervor, ob *quod est adaperire* zur liturgischen Formel gehörte oder eine von Ambrosius in den Taufkatechesen beigefügte Erklärung darstellt« (S. 29). Diese Aussage ist erstaunlich. Die Worte *»effetha, quod est adaperire«*, die ein Zitat aus dem Markusevangelium sind, kommen bis in unsere Zeit im *Rituale Romanum* vor. Wie kann der Verf. bezweifeln, ob sie bei Ambrosius zur Formel gehören? Die Ursache liegt darin, dass er die Worte *quod est adaperire* als eine 'Erklärung' auffasst und übersetzt: »Effeta, das heisst *öffnen*«. Falls *adaperire* tatsächlich ein Infinitiv wäre, und die Bedeutung des Textes wäre »Das 'hebräische' Verb bedeutet 'öffnen'«, könnten die Worte *quod est adaperire* kaum der Formel zugehören. Aber wenn man *adaperire*, wie das bei Markus der Fall ist (vgl. das Griechische), als Imperativ Passiv auffasst, ist jeder Zweifel ausgeschlossen.

In *Sacr.* 1,2 sagt Ambrosius hinsichtlich des Markustextes: *Et ait (Jesus): »effatha«. Hebraicum verbum est, quod Latine dicitur »adaperire«*. Hier gibt er eine Paraphrase des Evangeliumtextes. Man soll jedoch auch hier nicht übersetzen »das im Lateinischem *adaperire* (öffnen) bedeutet«, sondern »das man im Lateinischen mit *adaperire* (öffne dich) benennt«. Es handelt sich um die *Übersetzung* des 'hebräischen' Wortes, nicht um die Erklärung des Verbs.

Diese Bemerkung sollte die Anerkennung dieser schönen Ausgabe nicht schmälern.

2312 GD *Leiden*, Haarlemmerstraat 106B J. C. M. VAN WINDEN

Karin Alt, *Philosophie gegen Gnosis. Plotins Polemik in seiner Schrift II 9* (Akad. der Wiss. und der Literatur, Mainz. Abh. der Geistes- und Sozialwiss. Klasse, 1990, Nr 7). Stuttgart, Franz Steiner Verlag. 74 S.

Diese Abhandlung enthält eine faszinierende Analyse der Schrift Plotins 'Gegen die Gnostiker'. Diese Analyse führt zu der Schlussfolgerung, dass Plotin in einem solchen Maße von der Wahrheit seiner platonischen Philosophie durchdrungen war, dass er das gnostische Modell der Weltdeutung nicht verstehen konnte.

Die Autorin kennt die beiden Denksysteme von innen heraus und

zeigt klar und deutlich, wie Plotins Argumente ihr Ziel nicht erreichen. Man soll sich hier nicht durch den Gebrauch bestimmter Begriffe irreführen lassen und meinen, dass Plotin in einer Periode seines Lebens gnostisch angehaucht war. Die gnostische Denkwelt ist ihm fremd.

Autoren, die es verstehen, so klar über eine so komplexe Materie zu schreiben sind selten. Die vorliegende Abhandlung ist in dieser Hinsicht beispielhaft.

2312 GD, *Leiden*, Haarlemmerstraat 106B J.C.M. VAN WINDEN

Maximi Confessoris *Quaestiones ad Thalassium* II. Quaestiones LVI-LXV una cum interpretatione Ioannis Scotti Eriugenae iuxta posita. Ediderunt Carl Laga et Carlos Steel (Corpus Christianorum. Series Graeca 22). Turnhout, Brepols/Leuven University Press, 1990. LXII, 363 p.

Dix années après la parution du premier tome de cet ouvrage (cf. *Vig.Chr.* 35, 1981, 438-439) les deux éditeurs louvanais viennent de publier le second. Une autre introduction était devenue nécessaire, parce que dans l'entre-temps les études maximiennes avaient progressé et plusieurs manuscrits grecs avaient surgi. Toutefois l'intérêt de ces nouveaux témoins est mince. Voyex l'appendix II, p. 346-349.

Le texte grec de Maxime et le texte latin de Jean Scot Erigène ont été constitués d'un façon très conscientieuse. On s'étonne comment Erigène a persisté à traduire le grec οὐκοῦν par 'non itaque', ou 'non ergo' ou 'non igitur', ce qui fait dire au latin le contraire du grec, comme on a observé dans l'introduction au premier tome (p. CV).

On ne peut que féliciter les auteurs de cette édition précieuse. Le travail d'un commentaire de ces textes difficiles peut commencer.

2312 GD, *Leiden*, Haarlemmerstraat 106B J.C.M. VAN WINDEN

Johannes van Oort, *Jerusalem and Babylon*. A study into Augustine's *City of God* and the sources of his doctrine of the Two Cities (Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 14). Leiden, Brill, 1991. 427 pp.

Augustine, the man, his theology, and his influence continue to inspire major works of scholarship. "The second founder of the ancient

faith,'' to quote Jerome's farsighted view in his lifetime (Augustine, *Letter* 195), is an assessment to be compared with that of another contemporary, the Manichee Secundinus' lament that Augustine could have been ''a second Paul'' had he remained in the sect (*Epistula Secundini* 5). These contemporary judgements of Augustine's standing have found a worthy exponent in the author's English version of this doctoral thesis devoted mainly to the problem of the sources of the *De Civitate Dei*. He has provided a thorough analysis of that work and at the same time written a readable as well as a scholarly, and in many ways original study, that holds the reader's attention from start to finish.

After an introduction outlining the current state of research on the *De Civitate Dei*, the author divides his work into three main sections. 'Augustine and his City of God' discusses Augustine's life and reasons for writing the work. The second section indicates that these were largely apologetic, and the third, the longest and most interesting, investigates the various possible sources for Augustine's theology of the two opposed cities or societies, Jerusalem and Babylon.

From the outset, the author emphasises importance of the North African background in moulding Augustine's ideas. A Numidian, perhaps Berber by birth, educated in a North African tradition based on the Latin Classics, he moved from a native Catholicism to Manichaeism, and back to a Catholicism that enabled him to assimilate Neo-Platonism with acceptance of the truth of Scripture under the authority of a universal Church. His religion was always Christ-centred. Not for a moment did he think of reverting to the traditional paganism of his father, nor to the intense martyr-dominated Donatism of the majority of his Numidian contemporaries. Cicero's *Hortensius* inspired him with the ideal of Wisdom. With this he associated for more than ten years the teaching of the Manichees which he regarded as ''true wisdom'', a Christianity that rid the believer of the intolerable baggage of the Old Testament and the authoritarian perscriptions of the Catholic Church. The author could have added perhaps another factor. If Augustine rejected the civic paganism of his father, he was nonetheless throughout his life a Roman provincial loyal to the empire, the rightness of whose institutions he never questioned. Whether he was writing in protest to the *curator* of Hippo in 396 (*Ep.* 35.3), or to his friend, Alypius, in c. 423 concerning the depredations of slave-traders in northern Numidia (*Letter* 10, Divjak), it is to Roman laws and Roman liberty that he appeals. This intense underlying loyalty to the idea of

Rome and its empire is a factor to be considered in any assessment of the *De Civitate*, and in particular, of its author's view of relations between the visible Church and the state.

Alongside the loyalty of a provincial to Rome went an equally intense missionary zeal. The Manichaean Hearer who succeeded in converting so many of his articulate and intelligent friends to Manichaeism before he parted finally from the sect in c. 384, was to spend the remainder of a long life attempting to bring ex-Manichees, Donatists, pagans, and Pelagians into the Catholic Church. The author rightly points to an early precis of some of the main features of the *De Civitate* in Augustine's *De Catechezandis Rudibus* (On how the uninitiated are to be instructed) compiled c. 400. In this work of instruction and apologetic Augustine writes of "two cities (*civitates*) one of the wicked, the other of the saints", of the righteous in this world being "on pilgrimage", and the story of salvation extending from creation to judgement. These themes are repeated in the *De Civitate* which, Augustine urges his Carthaginian friend, Firmus, in c. 427 to heed with the aim of entering fully on a journey towards the City of God. The two letters to Firmus, one discovered by Père Lambot and the other by Johannes Divjak in 1975, provide the clue which the author readily accepts, to the true reason why Augustine spent thirteen years of an immensely busy life compiling this vast work. (Both letters are published by Divjak in CSEL 88, as letters 1^{A} and 2).

Whence did he derive the ideas that had been maturing in his mind and which he now set down? The discussion of possibilities and alternatives shows the author at his best, making judicious assessments from a rare command of the evidence, explaining his conclusions cogently, and correcting earlier views where necessary, with courtesy. Two main sources stand out, which however, without the benefit of recent discoveries would have remained incompatible and subject to ongoing argument. The first is the background provided by ten or more years as a Manichee. The evidence for Manichaean influence on the writing of the *De Civitate* is compelling. To the end of his days the suspicion of crypto-Manichaeism hung around Augustine's neck like an albatross, diminishing his credibility. As Julian of Eclanum declared in the last phase of his great controversy with Augustine over the relations between Grace and Free-will, "If an Ethiopian shall change his skin or a leopard his spots, so even you (Augustine) will escape from Manichaean mysteries" (Augustine, *Opus imperfectum contra Julianum*, iv. 42).

The author points to the many similarities between Manichaean teaching concerning the two opposed kingdoms of Light and Darkness and that of Augustine, and in particular to the characteristics of the Earthly City in Bk. xi of the *De Civitate Dei*, "dark and beclouded, boiling with the lust of subduing and hurting" (*D.C.D.* xi. 33), a vivid description reminiscent of the Manichaean Kingdom of Darkness.

This, however, is not sufficient in itself, as Augustine time and again asserts the limited nature of his dualistic ideas. The devil was not by nature evil, but had of his free-will forsaken the truth. God remained sovreign. A second source could be more important, namely the writings of the Donatist theologian, Tyconius. Here too, the author is on sure ground, because even though to-date there is no direct evidence that Augustine drew on Tyconius' *Commentary on the Apocalypse*, the ideas and the phraseology one finds in later quotations from it, coincide too exactly with those which Augustine uses in the *De Civitate* for these to be merely coincidence.

Tyconius and his Donatist colleagues abhorred the Manichees. How then can derivation from both sources be justified? In his suggested solution, the author may have got near to the truth. He uses recent Manichaean documentary discoveries to show that the background of Mani's teaching was not Zoroastrianism, but the theology of a Jewish-Christian baptist sect. While there is nothing to show that the *Similitudes* of Hermas, with their stark division between "the city of God" towards which the Christian journeyed, and the "city of world" ever circulated in North Africa, this basic Jewish-Christian theme of the division of society into antithetical cities or "camps" became commonplace in North African theology, particularly on the Donatist side. (For Tertullian's use of the concept, see for instance, *De idololatria* 19). This was due in all probability to strong Jewish influences in the period of the formation of the North African Christian community in the last two decades of the second century. Though the author may be mistaken in his recourse to Hermas and even to pre-Christian (Covenanters') evidence in his search for the origins of Augustine's ideas of the Two Cities, he is almost certainly right in his conclusion. "The considerable similarity between Augustine and Manichaeism is to be attributed to their common Jewish-Christian background" (p. 357), a background he could have added, that embraced much of North African theology, especially that of the Donatists, and hence of Tyconius.

This is a finely researched study reaching novel conclusions. If the

author underestimates the loyalty felt by Augustine to the Roman empire as such throughout his life, and sometimes fails to appreciate the impact of actual events on his thought, he has nonetheless given a fresh impetus to the study of Augustine's life's work. In some ways, he has opened a new field in Augustinian studies, which makes Augustine more intelligible than previously as a North African theologian. He has shown too, the great value for understanding the history of early Christianity of recent literary and archaeological discoveries. His book deserves to be studied by all who are interested in the history of ideas and should assure the author an eminent place among Augustinian scholars.

The Clerks Cottage, Little Wilbraham, *Cambridge*, CB1 5LB W. H. C. FREND

Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas-Empire. I: André Mandouze, *Prosopographie de l'Afrique chrétienne (303-533)*. Editions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris, 1982. 1328 pages.

L'origine du projet auquel ce livre appartient remonte au temps de Theodor Mommsen et d'Adolf von Harnack. L'idée d'entamer une prosopographie du Bas-Empire leur revient, et d'importants travaux furent préparés sans toutefois conduire à une publication. Cela fut entre autres empêché par les événements de 1914-1918, et finalement le projet était abandonné en 1933. Après la deuxième guerre mondiale l'idée fut reprise conjointement en Angleterre et en France: A.H.M. Jones (Cambridge) s'orienterait avec ses collaborateurs sur la prosopographie profane, tandis que H.I. Marrou (Paris) préparerait la prosopographie chrétienne. En premier lieu l'édition par A.H.M. Jones, J.R. Martindale et J. Morris, *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, vol. I (A.D. 260-395), Cambridge 1971, vit le jour et elle fut suivie une décennie plus tard par J.R. Martindale, *PLRE*, vol. II (A.D. 395-527), Cambridge etc. 1980. La troisième partie qui couvre les années 527-640 est en préparation.

La mise en route de la *Prosopographie de l'Afrique chrétienne* date en fait de 1951. Henri-Irénée Marrou peut être considéré comme le fondateur et on rencontre encore une «Préface» principalement composée par lui. Une tâche très importante fut accomplie par Anne-Marie La

Bonnardière, célèbre pour ses études sur Saint Augustin. D'autres savants éminents comme Serge Lancel, connu entre autres pour l'édition des *Actes de la Conférence de Carthage de 411* (SC 194-195), et Charles Munier, dont le nom est indissolublement lié à l'édition critique des *Concilia Africae* (CCL 149), offrirent une très large contribution. En outre, quelques autres collaborateurs du Centre de Recherches Lenain de Tillemont (Laboratoire associé au CNRS, Université de Paris-Sorbonne) doivent être mentionnés: Claude Hélène Lacroix, Elisabeth Paoli-Lafaye, Stan-Michel Pellistrandi (spécialement pour la composition des *Fastes* de l'Eglise d'Afrique, pp. 1241-1309) et Françoise Pontuer (Addendum aux Fastes: Liste de correspondances entre les noms géographiques modernes et les toponymes ou ethniques anciens, pp. 1310-1317). Une refonte générale à partir d'une relecture des sources et la rédaction définitive de l'ouvrage sont l'œuvre d'André Mandouze. C'est sous son nom qu'est donc publié cette première partie de la *Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas-Empire.*

Celui qui examine cet ouvrage volumineux, est impressioné par l'ampleur de la recherche scientifique qui dût être accomplie. Pour la période mentionnée (A.D. 303-533) et la région considérée (l'Afrique du Nord chrétien et latin, c'est à dire les provinces Tripolitania, Byzacena, Proconsularis, Numidia, Mauretania Sitifensis, Caesariensis et Tingitana; l'Egypte et la Cyrenaica ne sont pas traitées) 2565 personnes au total sont décrites. Sur beaucoup d'entre-eux on ne sait malheureusement que fort peu, sur d'autres, par contre, on sait beaucoup et dans divers cas (par exemple: Alypius, Aurelius 1, Caecilianus 1, Cresconius 4, Donatus 5, etc.!) la prosopographie prend les dimensions d'une biographie à peu près complète. Ce qui est caractéristique pour tous les articles, c'est la construction chaque fois uniforme, scientifiquement complètement fondée, et en particulier la référence aux sources primaires. Celles-ci sont rapportées méticuleusement dans les — parfois nombreuses — notes en bas de l'article, avec mention des éditions les plus accréditées et accompagnées de l'indication précise des numéros de la page et de la ligne. Ainsi l'accent porte essentiellement sur les faits, non sur une quelconque opinion interprétative. Comme M. Mandouze le remarque à raison dans sa «Note de l'auteur» (p. 15), on échappe ainsi à une description préjugée des donatistes (comme le faisait, par exemple, Paul Monceaux, nonobstant certaines qualités durables de ses travaux) et c'est une présentation aussi objective que possible qui prend corps. Une observation identique peut être faite à l'égard de la description des

manichéens comme, par exemple, Faustus (Faustus 2), Felix (Felix 20) et Fortunatus (Fortunatus 2).

Sans exagération on peut dire que, par cette œuvre magistrale, il s'élève devant nous une vision prosopographique de l'Eglise Africaine, sous divers aspects originale et en tout cas exhaustive de la période 303-533. Les données prosopographiques concernant la periode avant la persécution de Dioclétien ne sont toutefois pas incorporées et ceci est à regretter, car on doit craindre que — en tout cas provisoirement — aucune description prosopographique des années 180-302 ne paraîtra. Pour la période après 533, alors que sur ordre de Justinien Belisarius mit fin à l'hégémonie des Vandales, une *Prosopographie Byzantine* est annoncée. Occasionnellement, référence est faite également à une future *Prosopographie de l'Italie chrétienne*, à paraître en tant que tome 2 de la *Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas-Empire*.

Comme on pouvait s'y attendre, la majorité des contributions est consacrée aux personnes appartenant au cercle d'Augustin, à ses partisans, ses opposants, ses correspondants, etc. La *PAC* est donc largement une prosopographie augustinienne. C'est à dessein que la personne d'Augustin n'est pas traitée elle-même: la prosopographie de celui-ci pouvant donner lieu à elle seule à un grand volume. Il me semble que grâce à l'ouvrage de A. Mandouze, *Saint Augustin. L'aventure de la raison et de la grâce*, un livre publié en 1968 à Paris aux Etudes Augustiniennes et ayant au total 797 pages, nous ayons néanmoins un tel volume à notre disposition. Quoi qu'il en soit, cet ouvrage frappe aussi pour ses diverses données prosopographiques et notamment pour ses nombreuses notes référant avec grande précision aux sources.

Tant sur le plan du contenu que sur celui de la réalisation — l'ouvrage entier de 1238 pages n'a que quelques erreurs d'impression et à la page 967 on constate dans les notes comme dans le texte un interligne divergent — la *PAC* de Mandouze et de ses collaborateurs est à considérer comme une contribution admirable de la science française. Depuis quelques années déjà cet ouvrage rend de nombreux services et il le fera certainement encore dans le futur. C'est avec de grands espoirs que les volumes complémentaires de la série sont attendus.

3703 AH *Zeist*, Van Renesselaan 24 J. VAN OORT

Gregorii Nysseni *Sermones*, pars II (Gregorii Nysseni Opera Vol. X 1), ed. G. Heil, J.P. Cavarnos, O. Lendle; volumen edendum curavit F. Mann. Leiden-New York-København-Köln, E.J. Brill, 1990. CCLXIII, 176 p.

Dreiundzwanzig Jahre nach der Erscheinung des ersten Bandes der Predigten Gregors liegt jetzt der zweite vor. Es war die Absicht die noch übrigen Sermones in einem Band herauszugeben. Dies erwies sich jedoch als unmöglich, nicht so sehr wegen des Umfangs der Predigten als aufgrund des handschriftlichen Materials. Die Beschreibung dieses Materials bezüglich der hier zu edierenden Predigten war schon erheblich, wie man ober sehen kann (263 Seiten).

In diesem Band wurden die sich auf Leben und Fest der Heiligen und Märtyrer beziehenden Sermones veröffentlicht, die anderen (z.B. *De deitate filii et spiritus sancti*) werden in Vol. X 2 erscheinen.

Die Herausgeber der Predigten dieses Bandes sind von früheren Ausgaben her bekannt. G. Heil hat *De vita Gregorii Thaumaturgi* bearbeitet, P.J. Cavarnos *De sancto Theodoro* und O. Lendle *In sanctum Stephanum* I und II, *In Basilium fratrem, In XL martyres* Ia, Ib and II.

Die Zahl der Handschriften dieser Predigten ist sehr gross, da diese nicht nur in Handschriften der Werke Gregors sondern auch in panegyrischen und liturgischen Manuskripten enthalten sind. Im ersten Teil dieses Buches werden die 376 Handschriften von F. Mann kurz beschrieben. Bei jeder Handschrift wird angegeben, welche Predigt(en) sie bietet. Aus dieser sehr nützlichen Liste entnimmt man, dass die meisten Manuskripten nur eine Predigt enthalten.

Jede Predigt hat also ihre eigene Überlieferungsgeschichte, die vom jeweiligen Herausgeber genau beschrieben wird. Dabei hat jeder für die Bezeichnung der Hyparchetypen sich verschiedener Siglen bedient; der eine gebraucht griechische, der andere lateinische, der dritte hebräische Buchstaben. Dass man in einem Buch wie diesem von Kenntnis des Lateinischen und Griechischen ausgeht ist selbstverständlich; dass man jedoch auch das Hebräische als bekannt voraussetzt, ist gewagt.

Das ganze Buch, die Prefationes wie auch die griechischen Texte und der textkritische Apparat, zeugen von äusserster Genauigkeit. Jeder der sich mit dem Nyssener befasst wird sich freuen, dass wiederum ein Teil seiner Werke in so vorzüglicher Form erschienen ist.

2312 GD *Leiden*, Haarlemmerstraat 106B J.C.M. VAN WINDEN

J.M. Tevel, *De preken van Basilius von Seleucië. Handschriftelijke overlevering — Editie van vier preken*. Dissertation Free University, Amsterdam. Utrecht, 1990. 376 pp.

This thesis defended recently at the Free University deals with the Greek homilies of Basil of Seleucia, and is meant as a preparatory study for a critical edition of the entire corpus of the homilies. It consists of three parts: (1) an inventory of all the manuscript witnesses of homilies which have been attributed to Basil; (2) the critical edition of four homilies (hom. 7 *In Abraham*, 11 *In Eliam*, 31 *In illud: Ecce ascendimus Hierosolymam* etc., and 35 *In publicanum et in pharisaeum*); (3) conclusions which can be drawn from the findings in parts 1 and 2 with regard to a future edition of all the sermons of Basil.

The most important result of the investigation is the discovery of the high value of the *Florentinus Laurentianus* VII, 1, which is qualified as "an old 'author's collection' which dates back to a very early period" (p. 358). This conclusion is reached through a comparison of the text of this manuscript with that of liturgical manuscripts in which some of Eusebius' homilies were circulated.

For those who cannot read the Dutch language the most important part of the book is the critical edition of the four homilies. The rest of the valuable research that this study contains will remain inaccessible to them until the appearance of the complete edition.

2312 GD *Leiden*, Haarlemmerstraat 106B J.C.M. VAN WINDEN

Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum. Sachwörterbuch zur Auseinandersetzung des Christentums mit der Antiken Welt, herausgegeben von E. Dassmann u.A. Lieferungen 113-115. Stuttgart, Anton Hiersemann, 1989.

Diese drei 1989 erschienen Lieferungen enthalten die folgenden Stichwörter: 'Hibernia' (L. Bieler); 'Hieropolis (Mabbog)' (H.J.W. Drijvers); 'Hierarchie' (G. O'Daly); 'Hierodulie' (W. Fauth/M.B. von Strizky); 'Hieroglyphen' (E. Winter); 'Hierokles I (Sossianus Hierocles)' (W. Speyer); 'Hierokles II (Neuplatoniker)' (L.G. Westerink); 'Hieronymus' (H. Hagendahl/J.H. Waszink); 'Hilarius von Poitiers' (J. Doignon); 'Himerios' (H. Gärtner); 'Himmel' (H. Bieten-

hard/A. Lumpe); 'Himmelfahrt' (C. Colpe); 'Himmelskönigin' (W. Fauth); 'Himmelsrichtung (kultische)' (A. Podossinov); 'Himmelsstimme' (W. Speyer); 'Himyar' (W. Müller); 'Hinken' (A. Lumpe); 'Hinrichtung' (N. Hyldahl/B. Salomonsen); 'Hiob' (E. Dassmann); 'Hippo Regius' (N. Duval); 'Hippokrates' (E. Temkin).

Gelehrte aus verschiedenen Ländern haben ihre Mitarbeit an diesen Lieferungen des R.A.C. geleistet, von Russland bis Amerika (U.S.), von Moskou bis Baltimore. Das Ergebnis ist eine Serie wertvoller Artikel. So werden z.B. zwei berühmte Autoren (Hieronymus und Hilarius) von Experten (Hagendahl/Waszink und Doignon) behandelt. Der im philosophische Bereich so wichtige Begriff 'Hierarchie' wird von O'Daly erörtert. Der Artikel 'Himyar' von W. Müller bietet einen Überblick der christlichen Missionsversuche in Südarabien.

Der umfangreichste Beitrag (75 Spalten) ist der alttestamentlichen Gestalt des 'Hiob' gewidmet. Bekanntlich is Hiob, 'der Leidende', 'der Geduldige', ein wichtiges Thema in Apologetik und Predigt. Der Artikel Dassmanns gibt davon eine ausführliche Übersicht. Eine Kleinigkeit möchte ich noch hinzufügen. Eusebius von Cäsarea entwirft in seiner *Demonstratio Evangelica* II 2 eine interessante Theorie über den Ursprung des Christentums. In 'unserem Retter und Herrn' ist die alte Form der Gottesverehrung, die alte Philosophie der Patriarchen, wiederum ans Licht getreten, nachdem sie in der Zeit des mosaïschen Gesetzes 'schlafend' gewesen war. Die Patriarchen besassen also die wahre Weisheit und wurden deshalb 'von Gott Geliebte' genannt. Eusebius nennt Enoch, Noach, Seth, Iapheth, Abraham, Isaak und Jakob, und fügt dann himzu: οἷς καὶ τὸν Ἰὼβ συναριθμεῖν εὔλογον (*Dem. Ev.* I 2, 4; vgl. I 5, 7; I 6, 13; V 2). Diese Theorie soll mit der Auffassung mancher Tannaiten verglichen werden, die meinen, dass Hiob Zeitgenosse Abrahams war (s. Sp. 368). Sie unterscheidet sich jedoch von der in Sp. 382 und 384 erwähnten Idee, die den Hiob in "die Prozession alttestamentlicher Gerechter" einreicht, denn hier denkt man an "Abraham *und die Profeten*" (vgl. Sp. 382). Die vom Verf. zitierten Worte des Paulus in der apokryphen *Visio Pauli*: "Ich sah dort Abraham, Isaak und Jakob, Lot und Hiob und andere Heilige", scheinen der Auffassung des Eusebius am nächsten zu kommen.

Diese Bemerkung ist nich als Kritik gemeint, sie soll nur als Zeichen meiner Bewunderung für die hier gebotenen Artikel gelten.

2312 GD *Leiden*, Haarlemmerstraat 106B J.C.M. VAN WINDEN

William S. Babcock, *Paul and the Legacies of Paul.* Southern Methodist University Press, Box 415, Dallas. XXVIII, 426 p. $ 32,50 cloth $ 16,95 paper.

"The question of Paul's place and influence in the history of Christianity seems ripe for reexamination" (Preface, p. IX).

Contents. Preface, Introduction.

I *Early Delineations of Paul.*

The End of the Line: Paul in the Canonical Book of Acts (Daniel R. Schwartz); Paul in the Writings of the Apostolic Fathers (Andreas Lindemann); Comment: Which Paul? (Martinus C. de Boer); Apocryphal and Canonical Narratives about Paul (Dennis R. MacDonald); Comment: What Does *Unpauline* Mean? (Stanley K. Stowers); Irenaeus' Use of Paul in His Polemic Against the Gnostics (Richard A. Norris, jr.); Literary Artifice and the Figure of Paul in the Writings of Tertullian (Robert D. Sider).

II *Paul in the Theological and Exegetical Tradition.*

Free Choice and the Divine Will in Greek Christian Commentaries on Paul (Robert L. Wilken); *Paulus Origenianus*: The Economic Interpretation of Paul in Origen and Gregory of Nyssa (Peter J. Gorday); The Man from Heaven: Paul's Last Adam and Apollinaris' Christ (Rowan A. Greer); John Chrysostom as an Interpreter of Pauline Social Ethics (Adolf Martin Ritter); Comment: Chrysostom and Pauline Social Ethics (Elizabeth A. Clark); Augustine and the Pauline Theme of Hope (Basil Studer, O.S.B.); Comment: Augustine's Pauline Legacies (R. A. Markus); Beyond the Body/Soul Dichotomy: Augustine's Answer to Mani, Plotinus, and Julian (Paula Fredriksen); Comment: Augustine, Paul, and the Question of Moral Evil (William S. Babcock).

III *Other Aspects of Pauline Influence.*

The Pauline Corpus and the Early Christian Book (Harry Y. Gamble); Archeological Traces of Early Christian Veneration of Paul (Ernst Dassmann). Notes, Bibliography, Indexes.

A. H. Armstrong, *Hellenic and Christian Studies.* Variorum 1990. XII, 317 p.

Introduction. I Some Advantages of Polytheism. II Iamblichus and Egypt. III The Negative Theology of *Nous* in Later Platonism. IV The Divine Enhancement of Earthly Beauties: The Hellenic and Platonic Tradition. V The Hidden and the Open in Hellenic Thought. VI Platonic Mirrors. VII Negative Theology, Myth and Incarnation. VIII The Self-Definition of Christianity in Relation to Later Platonism. IX Pagan and Christian Traditionalism in the First Three Centuries A.D. X Philosophy, Theology and Interpretation: The Interpretation of Interpreters. XI Two Views of Freedom: A Christian Objection in Plotinus, *Enneads* VI 8.[39] 7, 11-15? XII Dualism, Platonic, Gnostic and Christian. XIII The Way and the Ways: Religious Tolerance and Intolerance in the Fourth Century A.D.. XIV Itineraries in Late Antiquity. XV On Not Knowing too Much About God. Index.

David T. Runia, *Exegesis and Philosophy. Studies on Philo of Alexandria*. Variorum 1990. X, 308 p.

Preface. I Philo, Alexandrian and Jew. II How to read Philo. III Polis and megalopolis: Philo and the founding of Alexandria. IV The structure of Philo's allegorical treatises. V Further observations on the structure of Philo's allegorical treatises. VI Mosaic and Platonist exegesis: Philo on 'finding' and 'refinding'. VII Review of: R. Goulet, *La philosophie de Moïse*. VIII Philo's *De aeternitate mundi*: the problem of its interpretation. IX Redrawing the map of early Middle Platonism: some comments on the Philonic evidence. X History of philosophy in the grand manner: the achievement of H. A. Wolfson. XI Naming and knowing: themes in Philonic theology with special reference to the *De mutatione nominum*. XII God and man in Philo of Alexandria. XIII Review of F. Siegert, *Philon von Alexandrien: Über die Gottesbezeichnung "wohltätig verzehrendes Feuer" (De Deo)*. Addenda et Corrigenda. Index.

Michel Aubineau, *Chrystostome, Sévérien, Proclus, Hésychius et alii: Patristique et Hagiographie grecques. Inventaires de manuscrits, Textes inédits, Traductions, Études*. Variorum Reprints, London 1988. XVI, 366 p.

Ce recueil de 30 articles, publiés en 23 Revues, Mélanges ou Actes de congrès de 1972 à 1981, est divisé en quatre parties.

1. Inventaire de vingt-cinq manuscrits dont on ignorait le contenu (articles I-XI).

2. Identification d'une dizaine de pièces acéphales dans sept manuscrits (articles XII-XVIII).

3. Publication de quatre pièces inédites: texte, traduction, commentaire. XIX Zoticos de Constantinople, nourricier des pauvres et serviteur des lépreux. XX Une homélie pascale attribuée à S. Athanase d'Alexandrie, dans le Sinaiticus gr. 492 [CPG 2300]. XXI Une homélie grecque inédite «Sur tous les martyrs» attribuée à Jean Chrysostome (BHG 1191e). XXII Le panégyrique de Thècle attribué à Jean Chrysostome (BHG 1720); la fin retrouvée d'un texte mutilé. Compléments au dossier de sainte Thècle.

4. Notes de lecture sur la Clavis Patrum Graecorum, vol. II (IVe.s.); études sur Jean Chrysostome, Proclus de Constantinople, Hésychius de Jérusalem, Syméon le Nouveau Théologien, Nicétas d'Héraclée (articles XXIII-XXX). Addenda et corrigenda. Index.

Henri Crouzel, *Les fins dernières selon Origène*. Variorum 1990. X, 341 p.

Introduction. I Mort et immortalité. II L'exégèse origénienne de I Cor 3, 11-15 et la purification eschatologique. III Le thème platonicien du «véhicule de l'âme» chez Origène. IV La «première» et la «seconde» résurrection des hommes d'après Origène. V Les prophéties de la résurrection selon Origène. VI La doctrine origénienne du corps ressuscité. VII Les critiques adressées par Méthode et ses contemporains à la doctrine origénienne du corps ressuscité. VIII Fonti prenicene della dottrina di Ambrogio sulla

risurrezione dei morti. IX Différences entre les ressuscités selon Origène. X L'Hadès et la Géhenne selon Origène. XI A letter from Origen "to friends in Alexandria". XII L'apocatastase chez Origène. XIII «Quand le Fils transmet le Royaume à Dieu son Père»: L'interprétation d'Origène. XIV Origène a-t-il tenu que le règne du Christ prendrait fin? Index des textes d'Origène.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Giuseppe Peressotti, Letture dei Padri della Chiesa nei breviari del Medioevo. Analisi e confronto tra alcuni manoscritti di tradizione aquileiese e di quella romana. Scuola Cattolica di Cultura, Udine, 1990. 214 p.

Geoffroy d'Auxerre, Entretien de Simon-Pierre avec Jésus. Introduction, texte, traduction et annotation par Henri Rochais (Sources Chrétiennes 364). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1990. 328 p. 200 F.

Douglas R.A. Hare, The Son of Man. Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 1990. XIV, 316 p.

P.W.A.Th. van der Laan, Sedulius, Carmen Paschale, Boek 4. Inleiding, vertaling, commentaar. Oud-Beyerland 1990. Thesis in Dutch language, University Leiden. Available at the author's adress: Koetshuis 23, 3262 CW Oud-Beyerland.

Bernard de Clairvaux, Éloges de la nouvelle chevalerie. Vie de saint Malachie. Introductions, traductions, notes et index par Pierre-Yves Emery. Oeuvres Complètes XXXI (Sources Chrétiennes 367). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1990, 486 p. 280 F.

Mario Girardi, Basilio di Cesarea e il culto dei martiri nel IV secolo. Scrittura e tradizione (Quarderni di «Vetera Christianorum» 21). Istituto di Studi classici e cristiani, Università di Bari, 1990. 317 p.

Antonio Acerbi, L'Ascensione di Isaia. Cristologia e profetismo in Siria nei primi decenni del II secolo (Studia Patristica Mediolanensia 17). Vita e Pensiero, Pubblicazioni dell' Università Cattolica, Milano 1989.

Tertullien, Contre Marcion, Livre I. Introduction, texte critique traduction et notes par René Braun (Sources Chrétiennes 365). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1990. 314 p. 184 F.

Franz Brunhölzl, Histoire de la littérature latine du Moyen Age. Tome I: De Cassiodore à la fin de la renaissance carolingienne, Vol. I: L'époque mérovingienne. Traduit de l'allemand par Henri Rochais. Compléments bibliographiques pour l'édition française par Jean-Paul Bouhot. Brepols 1990. 327 p.

Origenes, Commentarii in Epistolam ad Romanos Libri I et II/Römerbriefkommentar Buch I und II. Übersetzt und eingeleitet von Theresia Heither OSB (Fontes Christiani 2/1). Herder, Freiburg-Basel-Wien-Barcelona-Rom-New York 1990.

Ambrosius, De Sacramentis, De Mysteriis/Über die Sakramente, Über die Mysterien. Übersetzt und eingeleitet von Josef Schmitz CSSR (Fontes Christiani 3). Herder, Freiburg usw., 1990.

Tertullian, De exhortatione castitatis. Ermahnung zur Keuschheit. Herausgegeben und übersetzt von Hans-Veit Friedrich (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 2). Stuttgart, B.G. Teubner, 1990.

Vincenza Zangara, Exeuntes de corpore. Discussioni sulle apparizioni die morti in epoca agostiniana (Biblioteca della Revista di Storia e Letteratura Religiosa, Studi 1). Firenze, Leo S. Olschki, 1990. XVIII, 225 p.

Arnobii Iunioris Commentari in Psalmos, cura et studio Klaus-D. Daur (Arnobii Iunioris Opera Omnia; pars I. Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina XXV). Turnholti, Brepols, 1990.

La Coppia nei Padri. Introduzione, traduzione e note di Giulia Sfameni Gasparro, Cesare Magazzù, Concetta Aloe Spada (Letture Cristiane del Primo Millennio 9). Edizione Paoline, Corso Regina Margherita, 2-10153 Torino, 1991. L. 35.000.

David T. Runia, Exegesis and Philosophy. Studies on Philo of Alexandria. Variorium 1990. X, 308 p.

Colin Starnes, Augustine's Conversion. A Guide to the Argument of Confessions I-IX. Wilfred Laurier University Press, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada. N2L 3C5. XV, 303 p. $ 45.00 cloth (US).

Bernard Pouderon, Athénagore d'Athènes (Théologie Historique 82). Paris, Beauchesne, 1990.

Iréna Backus, Lectures humanistes de Basile de Césarée. Traductions Latines (1439-1618). (Collection des Études Augustiniennes. Serie Antiquité 125). Paris, Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 1990 (Diffusion: Éditions Brepols). 306 p.

Rudolf Riedinger, Der Codex Vindobonensis 418. Seine Vorlage und seine Schreiber (Instrumenta Patristica 17). Steenburgis, In Abbatia S. Petri/Kluwer, Academic Publishers, 1989. 108 S. + 60 Tafeln (60 Seiten des Cod. Vind. 418).

Peter Pilhofer, Presbyteron Kreitton, Der Altersbeweis der jüdischen und christlichen Apologeten und seine Vorgeschichte (Wiss. Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. 2. Reihe, 39). Tübingen, J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1990. XV, 339 S. DM 78,—.

Inger Marie Lindboe. Women in the New Testament. A Select Bibliography (Bibliography Series 1). University of Oslo, Faculty of Theology. 90 p.

Pierre Maraval, La Passion inédite de S. Athénogène de Pédachthoé en Cappadoce (BHG 197). Introduction, édition, traduction. Appendice: Passion épique de S. Athénogène de Pédachthoé. Edition et traduction (Subsidia Hagiographica 75). Société des Bollandistes, 24 Boulevard Saint-Michel, B 1040 Bruxelles 1990. 120 p. BEF. 700.

ΣΤΥΛΙΑΝΟΥ Γ. ΠΑΠΑΔΟΠΟΥΛΟΥ, ΠΑΤΡΟΛΟΓΙΑ, ΤΟΜΟΣ Β' Ο ΤΕΤΑΡΤΟΣ ΑΙΩΝΑΣ ('Ανατολή καί Δύση). ΑΘΗΝΑ 1990. 757 S.

Tertulliano, Scorpiace. A cura di Giovanna Azzali Bernardelli (Biblioteca Patristica). Nardini Editore, Centro Internazionale del Libro, Firenze 1990. 338 p. L 34.000.

Frank Unruh, Das Bild des Imperium Romanum im Spiegel der Literatur an der Wende vom 2. zum 3. Jh. n. Chr. (Habelts Dissertationsdrucke. Reihe Alte Geschichte 29). Bonn, Dr. Rudolf Habelt GMBH, 1991. 210 S.

Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel. 12 Esaias. Ed. Roger Gryson. Fasc. 5 (Is. 10,20-14,13). Freiburg, Herder, 1990.

Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel 25 (Pars II) Epistulae ad Thessalonicenses, Timotheum, Titum, Philemonem, Hebraeos. Herausg. von Hermann Josef Frede. 9. und 10. Lieferung (Hbr 10,28-13,10). Freiburg, Herder, 1991.

Maximi Confessoris Opuscula exegetica duo: Expositio in Psalmum LIX. Expositio Orationis Dominicae. Edidit Peter van Deun (Corpus Christianorum. Series Geaeca 23). Turnhout, Brepols/Leuven, University Press, 1991.

Alain Desreumaux, Répertoire des Bibliothèques et des Catalogues de Manuscrits Syriaques. Avec la collaboration de Françoise Briquel-Chatonnet. Édition du CNRS, 15, quai Anatole France, 75700 Paris. 285 p. 200 F.

Helmut Koester et François Bovon, Genèse de l'écriture chrétienne (Mémoires premières). Brepols. 140 p. 500 BFR.

Richard Landes et Catherine Paupert, Naissance d'Apôtre. La Vie de Saint Martial de Limoges. Un apocryphe de l'an Mil. Brepols. 105 p. 500 BFR.

Maria Vittoria Cerutti, Antropologia e Apocalittica (Storia delle Religioni 7). Roma, «l'Erma» de Bretschneider, Via Cassiodoro 19. 1990. 190 p.

E.P. Meijering, Athanasius, De Incarnatione Verbi. Einleitung, Übersetzung, Kommentar (in enger Zusammenarbeit mit J.C.M. van Winden). Amsterdam, J.C. Gieben, 1989. 432 S. 120,— Gld.

Ignacio di Antioquía, Cartas. Policarpo di Esmirna, Carta. Carta de la Iglesia di Esmirna a la Iglesia de Filomelio (Martirio di Policarpo). Introducción, traducción y Notas de Juan José Ayán Calvo (Fruentes Patrísticas 1). Editorial Ciudad Nueva, Madrid, 1991. Fine bilingual edition with informative introductions and notes.

Charles T. Changsoo Nahm, The Debate Concerning the «Platonism» of Early Christianity. A Bibliographical Study (Diss. Univ. de Navarra). Pamplona, 1990. 245 p.

Stephan Borgehammer, How the Holy Cross Was Found. From Event to Medieval Legend. With appendix of Texts (Bibliotheca Theologiae Practicae 47). Stockholm, Almquist & Wiksell International, 1991. 326 p. SEK 195,—.

Agostino d'Ippona «De moribus ecclesiae catholicae et de moribus Manichaeorum» «De quantitate animae». Commenti di J.K. Coyle, F. Decret, A. Clerici, E.L. Fortin, M.A. Vannier, P. Porro, G. Balido (Lectio Augustini. Settimana Agostiniana Pavese 7). Edizioni «Augustinus», Palermo, 1991. 213 p. L. 30.000.

Call for Manuscripts

The editors of Vigiliae Christianae invite the submission of scholarly manuscripts (e.g. monographs, text editions, bibliographical tools) for publication in the Supplements series of their journal. Manuscripts may deal with any aspect of early Christian life, tradition and culture covered by the mother journal. They should be written preferably in English (German and French are acceptable) and be no longer than 500 and no shorter than 150 double-spaced MS pages in length. Authors of unrevised doctoral theses are asked to first send an abstract. Works will be considered for publication by a process of peer review.

Manuscripts or enquiries may be directed to:

Julian Deahl, Senior Editor, E.J. Brill, P.O.B. 9000, 2300 PA LEIDEN, The Netherlands, fax. (..31) 71-317532,

who can also supply further details of the series, the review procedure and of general style requirements.

Vigiliae Christianae 45 (1991), 313-326, E. J. Brill, Leiden

STRUKTUR UND ZUSAMMENHANG DES APOLOGETISCHEN WERKES VON ATHANASIUS

VON

E.P. MEIJERING

Die Schriften *Contra Gentes / De Incarnatione Verbi*[1] werden, wie aus dem ersten Kapitel von *DI* klar hervorgeht, von Athanasius als zwei Hälften einer Schrift dargestellt. Die kritische Forschung muss hier natürlich die Frage stellen, ob es sich in diesem Falle tatsächlich von Anfang an um *eine* Schrift handelte, oder ob zwei Schriften zusammengefügt worden sind, nachdem beide getrennt entstanden waren. Letzteres könnte sich dann als zutreffend erweisen, wenn zwischen beiden Teilen klare Gegensätze hinsichtlich des Lehrinhaltes feststellbar wären. In der modernen Forschung schwankt das Urteil hierüber. Einerseits wird das generelle Urteil ausgesprochen, *CG* sei eine Einleitung zu *DI* und als solche bereits ein Bekenntnis des Glaubens an das inkarnierte Wort[2]. Andererseits sieht man aber auch klare Unterschiede oder sogar Widersprüche, so vor allem darin, dass die Sünde in *CG* anscheinend nur eine Besudelung der menschlichen Seele ist, die der Mensch selbst reinigen kann, während die Sicht in *DI* viel pessimistischer ist. Dort wird gesagt, dass nur die Inkarnation des Wortes den vom Sündenfall verursachten Tod überwinden kann.[3] In *DI* (3) wird von Anfang an die Schwäche der menschlichen Natur betont. *CG* bietet dagegen ein ,,optimistischeres Bild, insbesondere in den Kapiteln 30-34, in denen die Möglichkeit der Kontemplation des Göttlichen gelehrt wird. Mit dieser Vorstellung wird in *DI* gebrochen. Athanasius hat nach einer ,,flirtation'' mit dem Neuplatonismus in *CG* diesen später gänzlich verworfen.[4]

Im vorliegenden Aufsatz soll nun der Versuch gemacht werden aufzuzeigen, dass das apologetische Werk des Athanasius in dem Sinne ein harmonisches Ganzes darstellt, als nicht nur die zweite Hälfte sich klar an die erste anschliesst, sondern auch die erste offenbar schon im Hinblick auf die zweite verfasst wurde. Wir achten dabei auf sowohl die expliziten als auch die impliziten Hinweise auf *CG*, die sich in *DI* finden lassen. Zudem wird der Regel gefolgt, dass man einem Autoren solange

glaubt, als nicht bewiesen werden kann, dass er eine unrichtige Darstellung der Dinge gibt. Die Rückverweise in *DI* auf *CG* nun verknüpfen in Athanasius' eigener Darstellung die beiden Hälften. Sehen wir sie uns an um festzustellen, ob sie auf mehr als nur einen künstlich zustande gebrachten Zusammenhang hinweisen.

Es seien zunächst die Stellen in *DI* angeführt, wo Athanasius explizit auf *CG* hinweist:
1) Im Eröffnungssatz (*DI* 1,1-4)[5] sagt er, im Vorangehenden die Verirrung der Heiden in der Abgötterei beschrieben und gezeigt zu haben, wie sich die Heiden die Abgötter ersannen. Dies bezieht sich an sich auf den ganzen ersten Teil von *CG* (1-29), insbesondere aber auf *CG* 2,1-5.
2) Im dann folgenden Satz sagt er, auch bezüglich der Gottheit des Wortes des Vaters sowie seiner Vorsehung und Macht über alle Dinge einige Andeutungen gemacht und verdeutlicht zu haben, dass der gute Vater in ihm alle Dinge ordnet, und alles von ihm bewogen und in ihm lebendig gemacht wird. Hier wurde offenbar insbesondere an *CG* 40-42 sowie an 46,47-60 gedacht.
3) Im ersten Kapitel von *DI* (1,24-36) nennt er ferner ausführlich den Grund, weshalb die Erörterungen in *CG* als Hintergrund der Darlegungen in *DI* so wichtig sind: Wenn gezeigt worden ist, dass das Wort an sich eine unkörperliche Natur hat, dann ist klar, dass es nicht aufgrund natürlicher Notwendigkeit (wie jeder andere Mensch) einen Körper hatte, es sich vielmehr aus Güte wegen unseres Heiles in einem Körper offenbart hat. Wenn gezeigt worden ist, dass der Vater in seinem Wort erschaffen hat, dann erweist es sich auch als nicht widersprüchlich, dass er in demselben Worte alles erneuert. Hier bezieht sich Athanasius wohl in erster Linie auf *CG* 41,5-6 (vgl. 35,1-7), wo er betont hatte, dass das (wie der Vater) seiende und nicht zusammengesetzte (d.h. nicht körperliche, siehe *CG* 28) Wort aus Güte die Welt erschaffen hat. Hiermit ist unmissverständlich die Hauptabsicht des zweiten Teiles genannt worden, nämlich zu zeigen, dass Gott der Erlöser kein anderer als Gott der Schöpfer ist.
4) Im vierten Kapitel wird das sich Abwenden von der Gotteserkenntnis und das Ersinnen des Bösen als Grund genannt, weshalb die Todesdrohung Gottes verwirklicht wurde (4,12-15). Hier wird offenbar auf *CG* 3 zurückverwiesen, der Hinweis ist aber so eingebaut worden, dass er sich nur auf den Sündenfall und nicht auf die Todesdrohung beziehen kann. Von der Todesdrohung war nicht in *CG* 3, sondern nur in *DI* 3 die Rede gewesen.

5) In *DI* 11,29f sagt Athanasius, dass er bereits gezeigt habe, wie die Menschen die Ehre Gottes auf hölzerne, steinerne und jegliche Art materieller Dinge übertrugen, ja, noch mehr als dieses taten. Hier sind die Formulierungen in *CG* 9,15ff und 20ff aufgenommen worden (vgl. auch *DI* 43,15ff).
6) In demselben Kapitel bezieht er sich erneut auf die verwerfliche Praxis der Tier- und vor allem der Menschenopfer (*DI* 11,32-34), siehe hierzu *CG* 24-25.
7) In *DI* 32,1ff wird in der Beweisführung für die Auferstehung auf die in *CG* 35,1-9 aufgestellte These zurückverwiesen, dass der in seiner Natur unsichtbare Gott durch seine Werke erkannt werden kann. Dem wird noch hinzugefügt, dass, wenn es keine Werke gibt, man mit Recht dem nicht in Erscheinung Tretenden nicht glaubt. Auch hier wird eine anti-marcionitische Wendung aus *CG* 35,14-16 aufgenommen, in der es geheissen hatte, dass Gott seine unsichtbare Natur nicht missbrauchte und sich nicht gänzlich unbekannt liess.

8) In *DI* 51,23 wird erneut auf den Götzen- und Opferdienst hingewiesen (siehe *CG* 24-25).

Dies sind explizite Hinweise in *DI* auf Ausführungen in *CG*. (Im Laufe von *DI* wird natürlich auch auf frühere Darlegungen in *DI* zurückverwiesen, siehe 5,5 (auf 3,18f), 6,5 (auf 4,16f), 20,1ff (auf das ganze Vorangehende), 20,34 (auf 9,3ff), 30,2 (auf 27-29), 30,7 (ebenfalls auf 27-29), 42,16 (auf 41), 45,5f (auf 15ff). In ähnlicher Weise gibt es auch innerhalb von *CG* Rückverweise, siehe 3,1 (auf 2), 4,15 (auf 4,8), 4,27f (auf 4,11), 8,32 (auf 8,21ff), 18,3 (auf 12ff), 29,44 (auf 1,42), 34,1 (auf 30,20ff), 38,30 (Zusammenfassung von 23).) Die Zahl der expliziten Wiederholungen ist also relativ gross. Athanasius ist sich dessen selbst bewusst. Er erklärt (*DI* 20,19ff), man solle sich nicht darüber wundern, wenn er oft dasselbe sage. Wenn man vom Wohlgefallen Gottes spreche, dann solle man in mehrfacher Weise dasselbe sagen und eher den Vorwurf der Wiederholung hinnehmen, als den, dass man etwas von dem, was gesagt werden musste, wegliess. Tatsächlich beziehen sich die Hinweise in *DI* auf was bereits in *CG* gesagt worden war auf zentrale Gedanken: Der Ursprung der Abgötterei, die Gottheit des Wortes, die Folgen des Sündenfalls, die Offenbarung des unsichtbaren Gottes durch sichtbare Werke. Allerdings beweist das, was wir bisher festgestellt haben, noch nicht, dass es sich bei *CG* / *DI* tatsächlich um ein einheitliches Ganzes handelt. Es besteht an sich noch die Möglichkeit, dass Athanasius, nachdem er sich einmal entschlossen hatte, der Abhandlung *CG* noch die *DI* hinzuzufügen, er absichtlich einige Ver-

bindungen legte, die nicht mehr als eine oberflächliche Einheit zustande brachten. Die enge Verbindung zwischen den beiden Teilen ergibt sich aber nicht nur aus expliziten Rückverweisen.

In *DI* 12-13 beschreibt Athanasius, welche Offenbarungswege Gott mit den Menschen beschritten hat. Der erste Weg war die gnädige Erschaffung des Menschen nach dem Bilde Gottes. Dieser hätte genügen sollen. In *CG* 2 war dargelegt worden, was die Erschaffung nach dem Bilde Gottes für das Leben Adams im Paradies bedeutete (kurz wiederholt in *DI* 3), in *CG* 3-29, wie der Mensch die hiermit gegebene Möglichkeit der Gotteserkenntnis verwirkte und in *CG* 30-34, wie der Mensch sie hätte wiedererlangen sollen. Der zweite Weg war die Offenbarung durch die Werke der Schöpfung, er war in *CG* 35-45,16 beschrieben worden. Dem Menschen war dieser Weg allerdings auch schon vor dem Sündenfall offenbart worden, siehe *CG* 2,10f. Der dritte Weg ist die Offenbarung durch das Alte Testament: er war in *CG* 45,17-46 beschrieben worden. Als der Mensch über diese drei Wege die Gotteserkenntnis nicht erlangen konnte, erschien das Wort, das ihn im Anfang erschuf, in einem menschlichen Körper, um so das Bild Gottes und damit die Gotteserkenntnis im Menschen zu erneuern. Dies war zwar nicht in *CG* besprochen worden, ist aber dennoch das zentrale Thema von *DI*. Somit stellt sich der globale Aufbau des Doppelwerkes so dar, als dass von den vier Wegen der Gottesoffenbarung drei in *CG* behandelt werden und der vierte in *DI*. In den Hauptsachen kann sich keine Veränderung in den Ansichten des Athanasius vollzogen haben, etwa in dem Sinne, dass er in *CG* den Heiden aufgrund einer ,,natürlichen Theologie'' weiter entgegen käme als in *DI*, das ,,christozentrische Theologie'' bietet. Die Feststellung in *DI* 12, dass der Mensch über die ersten drei Wege Gotteserkenntnis hätte erlangen können, er sie aber wegen seiner Sünde eben faktisch nicht erlangte, war auch bereits in *CG* getroffen worden (30,2ff; 34,27ff; 45,12ff, 36ff). Athanasius korrigiert also in *DI* nicht die Ausführungen zur Möglichkeit der Gotteserkenntnis, wie er sie in *CG* geboten hatte, vielmehr führt er sie fort. Bereits in *CG* war festgestellt worden, dass sich der Mensch nicht auf die von Gott früher gebotenen Wege begeben hat, deshalb war ein weiterer Weg, der sich den früher genannten logisch anschliesst, notwendig. Er wird in *DI* beschrieben. — Das Offenbarungsschema, das dem Doppelwerk zugrundeliegt, ist freilich nicht von Athanasius erdacht, sondern der Tradition entnommen worden.[6]

Achtet man nicht nur auf die Stellen, an denen sich Athanasius explizit auf frühere Aussagen bezieht, sondern auch auf alle die Fälle, an denen er es implizit tut, dann wird die innere Harmonie des Doppelwerkes noch deutlicher. Es ergibt sich, dass er die in *CG* vorliegenden Gedanken und Formulierungen in der zweiten Hälfte des Doppelwerkes fortwährend wieder aufnimmt und wahrscheinlich öfters bereits in *CG* bewusst so formulierte, dass er den Weg für später erst in *DI* Vorgetragenes bereitete.

In *DI* 2,1-15 greift er die epikureische Ablehnung der Schöpfung und Vorsehung an. Wenn es keine Schöpfung gäbe, dann sei die Verschiedenheit der Dinge unerklärbar. Dann sollte es nur eine Körpermasse geben, z.B. nur die Sonne oder den Mond, oder bei den menschlichen Körpern nur den Fuss, die Hand oder den Kopf. Die faktische Ordnung der verschiedenen Dinge weise auf eine Ursache hin, den Schöpfergott. Dies ist eine kurze Zusammenfassung von *CG* 37. — In *DI* 2,16-32 widerlegt er die Lehre der Platoniker, dass Gott die Welt aus einer selbst bereits existierenden und ungewordenen Materie erschaffen hat, mit dem Argument, dass dies Schwäche im Schöpfer impliziert, der nur wie ein menschlicher Künstler schaffen könne, und der nicht selbst Ursache der Materie sei. Hier greift er die Argumentation in *CG* 6,1-11 auf, mit der er sich der Lehre widersetzt hatte, dass das Böse eine eigene Substanz hat. In dem Falle ist Gott, wenn er diese Substanz erschaffen hat, also die Ursache des Bösen; wenn er sie aber nicht erschaffen hat, ist er nicht mehr die Ursache aller Dinge. Letztere Alternative verwendet er in *DI* 2 gegen die Lehre von der Schöpfung aus einer ewigen Materie. — Der Widerlegung der epikureischen und der platonischen Lehre von der Entstehung der Welt folgt ein Angriff auf die marcionitische Lehre von einem Schöpfer, der ein anderer Gott sei als der Vater Jesu Christi. Die Charakterisierung der marcionitischen Lehre in *DI* 2,33-34 nimmt die Formulierungen in *CG* 6, dass der Schöpfer das Böse erschaffen hat, auf, während im Unterschied hierzu in *DI* 2 nur gesagt wird, dass der Schöpfergott ein anderer ist als der Vater Jesu Christi. Dieser Unterschied ist natürlich dadurch zu erklären, dass in *CG* 6 die Existenz einer von Gott unabhängigen Substanz des Bösen angegriffen wird. Marcion erweist sich insofern als ein Schüler Platons, als er eine böse Substanz neben dem guten Gott annimmt. Der Unterschied zu Platon liegt nun darin, dass er diese böse Substanz (die er für die Welt hält, während sie für Platon in der Darstellung des Athanasius die Materie ist) als von einem bösen Gott erschaffen lehrt, während sie nach Platon (in der Dar-

stellung des Athanasius) von Ewigkeit her existiert hat. — In *CG* 6 war die marcionitische Lehre kurz mit zwei Bibeltexten (*Mark.* 12:29 und *Matth.* 11:25) und ausführlicher mit rationalen Argumenten widerlegt worden, in *DI* folgen einige weitere Bibeltexte (*Matth.* 19:4-6, *Joh.* 1:3).

In *DI* 3,14ff führt er die Güte Gottes als Ursache der Schöpfung an, — aus besonderer Güte habe Gott den Menschen nach seinem Bilde erschaffen, um ihm so die Möglichkeit eines ewigen Lebens zu geben (eine Möglichkeit, die die Tiere nicht hatten). Hier formuliert er in einer Weise, die bewusst das in *CG* 41,13ff Gesagte fortführt. In beiden Abschnitten wird zunächst auf den berühmten Passus in Platon, *Timäus* 29E, angespielt, in dem ebenfalls die Güte Gottes die Ursache der Welt genannt wird. In *CG* 41,14ff wird die Güte primär als Grund für die Erschaffung der Menschen genannt. Dann wird von der gesamten Schöpfung gesagt, sie müsse an sich wegen ihrer zerfliessenden Natur wieder in das Nichts versinken, was Gott aber verhindere, indem er alle Dinge in seinem ewigen Wort schaffe und damit an seinem Wort teilhaben lasse. Hiermit ist nun nicht gemeint, dass alle Dinge in der Schöpfung eine ewige Existenz haben, wohl aber, dass sie wegen der Schöpfung durch das ewige Wort vor einem sofortigen Untergang behütet werden. Als biblischer Beweis wird auf *Kol.* 1:15-18 hingewiesen; dass auch *Kol.* 1:18 („er ist das Haupt der Kirche") bereits hier angeführt wird, ist wohl ein erster Hinweis, dass das Schöpferwort sich auch inkarnieren wird (vgl. *Contra Arianos* 2,65). In *DI* 3,14ff ist die Argumentation umgekehrt. Dort wird die Güte Gottes zunächst als Grund für die Schöpfung aller Dinge mittels des Wortes genannt. Danach wird festgestellt, dass das menschliche Geschlecht aufgrund seiner Beschaffenheit nicht ewig existieren kann. Deshalb erbarmt sich Gott in besonderer Weise über das menschliche Geschlecht und erschafft es nicht nur mittels seines Wortes, sondern nach seinem eigenen Bild (dem Worte) und gibt so den Menschen durch die Teilhabe an der Macht des Wortes die Möglichkeit des ewigen Lebens. Folgerichtig formuliert er in *DI* 4,25, dass die Menschen wegen ihres Sündenfalls (mit dem sie die Teilhabe am Bilde Gottes verwirkt hatten) beim Tod entbunden werden und im Tode verbleiben, sowie in *DI* 21,24f, dass die Menschen nicht lange Zeit am Leben bleiben können, vielmehr zu einem bestimmten Zeitpunkt entbunden werden.

Die Beschreibung (der Folgen) des Sündenfalls in *DI* 5 entspricht den Formulierungen in *CG*. Der Mensch wendet sich auf Rat des Teufels von den ewigen Dingen ab (5,3, vgl. *CG* 3,5f, 15ff; 8,2ff), die Sünde

breitet sich immer weiter aus (5,14ff, vgl. *CG* 3,24ff; 4-5), und die Menschen erweisen sich im Sündigen als unersättlich (5,21f, vgl. *CG* 8,37). Die Sünde erreicht im widernatürlichen Geschlechtsverkehr ihren Höhepunkt (8,27ff, vgl. *CG* 26,7ff).

In *DI* 15 wird die Inkarnation des Wortes als eine Anpassung an die menschliche Schwäche beschrieben. Die Menschen waren gleichsam in tiefes Wasser untergetaucht, hatten ihre Augen nach unten gerichtet und suchten Gott im sinnlich Wahrnehmbaren. Deshalb erscheint Gott in einem Körper, um so den Menschen, der geneigt ist, ihn im Körperlichen zu erblicken (und damit der Abgötterei verfällt) wieder zur wahren Gotteserkenntnis zu führen (vgl. *DI* 12,8ff; 43,23ff). Der Vergleich mit dem Untertauchen in ein tiefes Wasser war in *CG* 8,21ff noch ausführlicher gezogen worden, auch um die Neigung zur Abgötterei zu erklären.

In den weiteren Erörterungen zur Menschwerdung ist es für Athanasius von grösster Wichtigkeit (offenbar gegen Celsus) zu zeigen, dass sie nicht bedeutet, dass das Wort Gottes vor der Menschwerdung nicht im menschlichen Bereich anwesend war und bei der Menschwerdung nicht in einem menschlichen Körper eingeschlossen war. Beim Vater seiend hat das Wort alle Dinge erfüllt, kein Teil der Schöpfung war seiner entleert (*DI* 8,1ff). Dies war bereits in *CG* 42,25ff und 46,45ff festgestellt worden. Bei der Menschwerdung war das Wort nicht in einem Körper eingeschlossen, sondern bewog mit seiner Kraft und Vorsehung alle Dinge. Seinem Wesen nach ist das Wort im Vater, seine Wirkung erstreckt sich über die ganze Schöpfung. Dies war in der Menschwerdung nicht anders. Das Wort war wohl in einem Körper, wirkte aber gleichzeitig in allen Dingen und war es ausserhalb aller Dinge. So konnte es gleichzeitig durch seine Werke in einem menschlichen Körper und durch seine Wirkung im All erkannt werden (17,1-13). Hier werden wiederum die Ausführungen in *CG* 42,25ff und 46,45ff aufgegriffen. — Die Anwesenheit des Wortes in einem menschlichen Körper darf nicht in allen Hinsichten mit der der Seele im Leibe verglichen werden. Die Seele ist an den Leib gebunden. Sie kann die Dinge ausserhalb des Leibes (z.B. die Himmelskörper) zwar betrachten, nicht aber darauf einwirken (*DI* 17,14ff). In *CG* 31,37ff war der Unterschied zwischen Seele und Leib u.a. damit bewiesen worden, dass die Seele, während sich der Leib in Ruhe befindet, die Himmelskörper betrachten, ferne Länder durchqueren und dabei Bekannten begegnen kann, — dies wird in ähnlichen Worten in *CG* 33,22ff wiederholt. Allerdings wird dort eingeschränkt,

dass sich die Seele nur *gleichsam* vom Körper entfernt, in Wirklichkeit aber in ihm bleibt. Da kein Leser hier an ein räumliches Verlassen des Leibes denken kann (der Körper würde ja sofort sterben, denn er wird von der Seele bewegt und belebt, siehe 33,10ff), kann die explizite Hinzufügung, dies geschehe nur gleichsam und die Seele bliebe tatsächlich im Leibe, nur bedeuten, dass Athanasius hier bereits die späteren Ausführungen in *DI* 17,14ff vorbereitet. — In einer weiteren Hinsicht ist die Anwesenheit der Seele oder des Geistes im Körper wohl als Illustration für die Inkarnation brauchbar. Die Griechen geben zu, dass das Wort Gottes in seiner Vorsehung alle Teile des Alls durchdringt. Dann ist es nicht unziemlich zu sagen, das das Wort auch in dem Teil des Alls, der ein menschlicher Körper ist, anwesend sei (*DI* 41). Die Kraft des Menschen durchdringt ja auch den ganzen Körper und befindet sich sogar in einem Zeh (42,1-3). Diese Argumentation ist in *CG* vorbereitet worden. In *DI* 41 leitet er seine Argumentation mit der Feststellung ein, dass die Griechen, wenn sie Freunde der Wahrheit sind, zugeben müssen, dass die Anwesenheit des Wortes in einem Körper nicht absurd ist. In *CG* 31 verteidigt er die Existenz einer Seele gegen gewisse Ketzer, die diese leugnen, u.a. mit der Feststellung, dass jeder, der ein Freund der Wahrheit ist, wahrnehmen kann, dass es neben den körperlichen Sinneswahrnehmungen im Menschen einen Geist gibt (31,12ff). Der Ausdruck ,,Freund der Wahrheit'' ist ein insbesondere für und von Philosophen gebrauchter[7]. Er fügt sich klar in die Argumentation in *DI*, die gegen Philosophen, welche die Inkarnation leugnen, gerichtet ist; in *CG* 31 aber wendet sich Athanasius gegen gewisse Ketzer, — kein Philosoph wird die Existenz einer Seele geleugnet haben. Dass er also auch in *CG* 31 den Ausdruck ,,Freund der Wahrheit'' verwendet, ist u.E. ein Indiz dafür, dass er die hieran anschliessende Argumentation in *DI* 41 an dieser Stelle bereits vorbereitet. Auch die These, dass die Griechen entweder die Existenz eines Wortes Gottes leugnen, oder lehren, dass sich das Wort Gottes in der ganzen Welt befindet (*DI* 41,8ff), ist in *CG* vorbereitet worden. Mit denjenigen, die verneinen, dass es ein Wort Gottes gibt, sind natürlich die Epikureer, die Schöpfung und Vorsehung leugnen, gemeint. Die Anerkennung eines schöpferischen Wortes Gottes gilt aber als die normale Lehrposition. In *CG* 40,40-42, hatte es schon geheissen, dass, wenn ein Ungläubiger noch die Frage stelle, ob es überhaupt ein Wort Gottes gibt, er wohl verrückt sei. — Die gleichzeitige Anwesenheit der Seele im ganzen Körper wird in *CG* 43,7ff als Beispiel fur die Anwesenheit des Logos im All gebraucht. In gleicher Sache kann die Seele

bewirken, dass das Auge sieht, das Gehör hört, die Hand betastet, der Geruch wahrnimmt, der Geschmack schmeckt, ja, oft kann sie sogar auf andere Glieder des Körpers einwirken, sodass auch die Füsse gehen. Die Einwirkung auf die Füsse wird als letztes genannt, dies entspricht der These in *DI*, dass die Kraft des Menschen sogar in einem Zeh zum Ausdruck kommt. — Die These in 41,17, dass die Griechen die Welt einen grossen Körper nennen, war bereits in *CG* 28,11 aufgestellt worden. Hier zeigt sich allerdings ein kleiner Unterschied zu *DI* 41. In *CG* 28 bekämpft Athanasius die These (wie sie u.a. in Platon, *Timäus* 32D-34B vorliegt, vgl. Albin, *Epitome* 12,3), die Welt sei ein grosser Körper und als solcher Gott. In *DI* 41 verwendet er gerade die Vorstellung, die Gottheit durchdringe den Weltkörper, für seine eigenen Zwecke. Es liegt natürlich kein Sinneswandel vor, da letztere Vorstellung, wie wir gesehen haben, auch bereits in *CG* zum Ausdruck gebracht wurde. Dass die Welt ein grosser Körper sei, ist für Athanasius brauchbar, dass das Wort Gottes sie durchdringt, ebenfalls, dass sie aber selbst Gott sei, natürlich nicht. — In diesem Zusammenhang führt Athanasius (mit einigen Änderungen) ein Wort aus dem *Politicus* Platons an (273 D/E), in dem es heisst, dass Gott das Ruder der Welt ergriff, als diese in Gefahr war, in den Ort der Ungleichheit wegzusinken (*DI* 43,35-38). Ohne expliziten Hinweis war bereits in *CG* 41,17-21 auf den gleichen Abschnitt bei Platon angespielt worden. Dort geschah dies im Zusammenhang mit der Lehre von der Schöpfung. Dass er den gleichen Passus in *DI* im Zusammenhang mit der Lehre von der Menschwerdung wieder aufnimmt, entspricht ganz der Absicht des apologetischen Doppelwerkes, das beweisen will, dass der Schöpfer und der Erlöser ein und derselbe Gott ist. Gott handelt also in der Erlösung aus demselben Motiv heraus wie bei der Schöpfung.

In *DI* 19,17f sagt Athanasius, dass die Sonnenfinsternis, das Erdbeben und das Zerreissen der Berge bei der Kreuziging Jesu zeigten, dass die ganze Schöpfung sein Sklave war. Diese These war in *CG* 37 vorbereitet worden und wird in *DI* 43 erneut verwendet. In *CG* 37,3 hatte es geheissen, dass die Elemente dem Worte wie Sklaven gehorchen. In *DI* 43,10ff wird auf die kritische Frage der Griechen, weshalb das Wort nicht in einem edleren Teil der Schöpfung als gerade in einem menschlichen Körper erschienen sei, geantwortet, nur die Menschen seien von Gott abgefallen, die Elemente hätten die Ordnung gewahrt.

In *CG* 3,28f war die Todesfurcht als Folge der mit dem Sündenfall gegebenen Begierden genannt worden. In *DI* wird mehrfach die Aufer-

stehung Christi als Ursache dafür genannt, dass der Mensch keine Todesfurcht mehr hat (27,9ff; 28,4ff), das Zeitliche nicht mehr beachtet, zum Ewigen aufblickt und den irdischen Ruhm für wertlos hält. — Gleicherweise macht der auferstandene Christus dem mit den verschiedenen Formen der Abgötterei gegeben Unfrieden (*CG* 4-5; 23) ein Ende (*DI* 50, 23ff, 52,20ff).

Die (u.a. von Celsus) gestellte Frage, weshalb Gott die Folgen des Sündenfalls nicht mittels eines Machtwortes behoben hat, wird damit beantwortet, dass ein Machtwort (νεῦμα) zur Entschaffung aus dem Nichts genügte, nicht aber zur Heilung des bereits Erschaffenen. Als Vorbereitung zu dieser These hatte es in *CG* geheissen, dass das Wort Gottes das All mittels eines Machtwortes zu einer harmonischen Einheit führt (42,27), dass es mit seinem Machtwort alles gleichzeitig ordnet (42,31,35).

Von diesem Befund her kann es nicht mehr überraschen, dass *CG* 1 nicht nur eine Einleitung zum ersten Teil des apologetischen Werkes bietet, sondern zu beiden. Athanasius spricht darin u.a. den Wunsch aus zu zeigen, dass der christliche Glaube nicht irrational und das Kreuz Christi nicht lächerlich ist, und dass man die Macht des auferstandenen Christus in seinen Werken anerkennen muss, die die Macht der Abgötterei bricht. Wer die sich in seinen Werken zeigende Macht Christi leugnet, der gleicht einem Menschen, der die Sonne, die sich hinter den Wolken befindet, lästert, während sie doch die ganze Welt erleuchtet (*CG* 1,34ff). Dieser bekannte Vergleich zwischen Christus und der erleuchtenden Sonne wird nicht nur in *CG* (7,18ff und 23,42ff), sondern auch in *DI* wiederholt, und zwar sowohl gegen die Juden (40,39ff) als auch gegen die Heiden oder sogar alle Menschen (29,8ff; 32,10ff; 55,13ff). Diese Einleitung bezieht sich zudem mehr auf den zweiten als auf den ersten Teil des apologetischen Werkes. Aber der erste Teil bietet hierzu die nötige Vorbereitung, denn darin war gezeigt worden, dass gerade die Abgötterei irrational ist, weil sie sich vom wahren Schöpfergott abwendet. Der Schöpfer stellt wieder her was der Mensch mit seinem Sündenfall verwirkt hat. Der Sündenfall und seine Folgen werden im ersten Teil beschrieben, die Wiederherstellung im zweiten.

An fast allen wichtigen Punkten schliesst sich die Argumentation in *DI* an *CG* an. Die Lehre von der Schöpfung durch das Wort ist die Voraussetzung für die Lehre von der Menschwerdung des Wortes. Die Menschwerdung des Wortes geschieht, nachdem sich früher dargebo-

tene Wege zur Gotteserkenntnis, wie sie in *CG* beschrieben worden waren, als faktisch ungenügend erwiesen hatten. Die Art der Anwesenheit in einem Körper wird in einer Weise beschrieben, dass Ausführungen zur Seele und zum Leib und zur Anwesenheit des Wortes im All, wie sie in *CG* gegeben worden waren, wieder aufgenommen werden können. Die Inkarnation wird als eine Anpassung an die menschliche Schwäche, wie sie in *CG* ausführlich erörtert worden war, dargestellt. Die Güte Gottes, die sich bei der Schöpfung betätigt, ist auch in der Menschwerdung am Werke.

Es kann freilich wohl eine ganz andere Frage gestellt werden, nämlich ob es einen gewissen gedanklichen Widerspruch innerhalb von *DI* gibt. Als Doppelmotiv der Menschwerdung wird die Überwindung des Todes und die Wiederherstellung der Gotteserkenntnis genannt. Bei der Gotteserkenntnis ist von drei Wegen die Rede, die der Mensch vor der Menschwerdung hätte beschreiten können. Vom ersteren Weg sagt Athanasius, dass er an sich genügte (*DI* 12,1), von dem zweiten und dritten, dass dadurch Gotteserkenntnis möglich wurde (*DI* 11,11 und 19). Bei der Überwindung des Todes wird allerdings betont, dass sie nur durch die Inkarnation geschehen konnte, und dass ein einfacher Sinneswandel (der die Gotteserkenntnis wiederhergestellt hätte) hier nicht genügt hätte (*DI* 7, vgl. 11,31f). Hier muss eine Frage gestellt werden: Was wäre geschehen, wenn sich der Mensch nun doch über die drei ersten Wege zu Gott hingewendet hätte? Dann wäre die Inkarnation also nicht notwendig gewesen, aber wie wäre dann der Tod überwunden worden? Athanasius kann nicht der Meinung gewesen sein, dass ein Leben in Gotteserkenntnis im Tode enden darf. Die Gotteserkenntnis impliziert ja das ewige Leben, siehe *CG* 2,9ff und *DI* 11,18ff. Er wird der Meinung gewesen sein, dass der Mensch dann nach dem Tode von Gott mit der Auferstehung belohnt worden wäre (vgl. *CG* 47). Ausserdem lehrt er natürlich die Unsterblichkeit der Seele, siehe *CG* 33. Auch in *DI* 12 beschreibt er diese Wege als reale Möglichkeiten zur Gotteserkenntnis, von denen der Mensch freilich keinen Gebrauch gemacht hat. Weil es reale Möglichkeiten waren, konnte er in *CG* die Menschen aufrufen, von ihnen Gebrauch zu machen. Aber dies widerspricht dem Gedankengang in *DI* 6-9, dass nur mittels der Inkarnation, in der das Wort für alle stirbt und für alle aufersteht, der Tod überwunden wird. Hier wird als Folge des Sündenfalls ein Verbleiben im Tode genannt (*DI* 3,38f), während in den übrigen Ausführungen auch nach dem Sünden-

fall noch eine unsterbliche Seele vorausgesetzt wird. Das traditionelle Schema, das Athanasius seinem apologetischen Werke zugrunde gelegt hat, bringt seine Gedanken zur Wiederherstellung der Gotteserkenntnis klar zum Ausdruck, aber es steht in gespannter Beziehung zu seiner in *DI* 6-9 aufgestellten These, nur die Inkarnation könne den Tod überwinden. Ohne den Sündenfall wäre die Inkarnation und die Auferstehung des Wortes nicht notwendig gewesen, der Mensch wäre dann von Gott aus dem Paradies in das Himmelreich versetzt worden (*DI* 3,29f). Hätte der Mensch nach dem Sündenfall von den ersten drei Wegen der Gotteserkenntnis Gebrauch gemacht, dann wäre die Inkarnation jedenfalls zur Wiederherstellung der Gotteserkenntnis auch nicht notwendig gewesen, und dann hätte Gott ihn nach dem Tode mit der Unsterblichkeit und der Auferstehung belohnt (was die Inkarnation zur Überwindung des Todes also auch überflüssig gemacht hätte). Das ganze Schema ist natürlich rückblickend aufgestellt worden, nämlich vom Faktum her, dass der Mensch die ersten drei Wege eben nicht beschritten hat. Wenn jemand nach der Menschwerdung Christi jetzt noch die Inkarnation für nicht notwendig halten würde, ,,weil man ja immer noch über die ersten Wege zu Gott gehen kann'', dann müsste Athanasius im Hinblick auf die Gotteserkenntnis dazu sagen, dass es dafür nunmehr zu spät sei, im Hinblick auf die Überwindung des Todes sagt er in *DI* 7 aber faktisch, dass sie nie genügt hätten. Es liegt zwar kein Gegensatz zwischen *CG* und *DI* vor, wohl aber eine gewisse Diskrepanz zwischen dem berühmten Gedankengang in *DI* 6-9 und dem Rest des apologetischen Werkes. Dort wird als *grundsätzlich einziger* Weg beschrieben was nach den sonstigen Ausführungen im apologetischen Werk der *einzig übrig gebliebene* Weg ist. Dies ist u.E. der einzige nennenswerte Widerspruch innerhalb des apologetischen Werkes, der allerdings keineswegs gegen die ursprüngliche Einheit seiner beiden Teile spricht. Athanasius wird ihn wohl nicht empfunden haben, da aufgrund des faktischen Verlaufs der Geschichte sowohl die Unsterblichkeit als auch die Gotteserkenntnis eben nur durch die Inkarnation wiederhergestellt worden sind. Der kritische Leser aber muss feststellen, dass Athanasius es eigentlich nur begrüssen kann, dass die Menschen die anderen möglichen Wege zur Gotteserkenntnis nicht beschritten haben und also auch seinem eigenen Aufruf, dies wohl zu tun, nicht gefolgt sind.

ANMERKUNGEN

[1] Die von J.C.M. van Winden aufgrund neuer Argumente erneut vorgeschlagene frühe Datierung des apologetischen Werkes ist u.E. die richtige (siehe seinen Aufsatz, On the Date of Athanasius' Apologetic Treatises, *Vigiliae Christianae* (29) 1975, SS 291ff) und nicht die von Ch. Kannengiesser befürwortete im ersten Exil (siehe dessen Aufsatz, La Date de l'Apologie d'Athanase „Contre les Paiens" et „Sur l'Incarnation du Verbe", *Recherches de Science Religieuse* (58) 1970, SS 383ff). Das hiergegen von M. Slusser (Athanasius, Contra Gentes and De Incarnatione: Place and Date of Composition, *The Journal of Theological Studies* (37) 1986, S 15, Anm. 3) vorgebrachte Argument, dass die in *CG* 6, *CG* 30 und *DI* 2 genannten Ketzer nicht alle Dualisten, und die dort gegebenen Andeutungen nicht „all-embracing" sind, ist nicht stichhaltig. In *CG* 6 und *DI* 2 wird der von *den* Ketzern gelehrte Dualismus bekämpft, in *CG* 30 ist nur von *einigen* Ketzern die Rede, die die Existenz einer Seele leugnen. Die Formulierung in *CG* 30 verstärkt das Argument Van Windens geradezu. Wenn Athanasius die Dualisten angreift, spricht er von *den* Ketzern (und kann er also nicht die Arianer meinen), wenn er diejenigen, welche die Existenz einer Seele leugnen, angreift, weiss er, dass nicht alle Ketzer diesen Standpunkt vertreten. Nur dieser Hinweis in *CG* 30 ist also nicht „all-embracing". — Gegen die These Susslers, aus der in *CG* 23 und *DI* 51 gebotenen geographischen Beschreibung ergebe sich, dass hier ein in Ägypten lebender Autor schreiben muss, darf wohl auf *DI* 33,32 und 36,28 sowie auf 37,43 hingewiesen werden, wo Athanasius von Ägypten als ἐκεῖθεν und ἐκεῖ spricht, — eine unerwartete Wendung für einen Autor, der sich dort selbst befindet. — W. Bienert bemerkt in seinem schönen Aufsatz, Zur Logos-Christologie des Athanasius von Alexandrien in Contra Gentes und De incarnatione, *Studia Patristica XXI*, Leuven 1989, S 411, gegen Van Winden, dass die Formulierung in *CG* 6 und *DI* 2 eine unübersehbare 'antiarianische' Spitze hat: Der Vater Jesu Christi ist der Schöpfer aller Dinge, der durch sein Wort geschaffen hat, — aber Athanasius sagt auch, dass durch den Logos alles geworden ist, und dass der Logos aus dem Nichts geschaffen hat. Hiermit ist das Verhältnis zwischen dem Vater und seinem Logos antiarianisch dargestellt worden. Bienert sagt aber selbst, dass diese Konsequenzen für das Verhältnis zwischen dem Vater und seinem Wort „fast unmerklich" gezogen worden sind. U.E. hätten die Arianer nicht merken können, dass sie in der geläufigen anti-marcionitischen Polemik in *CG* 6 und *DI* 2 mitgemeint sind. — Zur Datierung siehe ferner E.P. Meijering (in enger Zusammenarbeit mit J.C.M. van Winden), *Athanasius: De Incarnatione Verbi. Einleitung, Übersetzung, Kommentar*, Gieben, Amsterdam 1989, SS 11ff.

[2] P.Th. Camelot, *Athanase d'Alexandrie, Contre les Païens* (S.C. 18 bis), Paris 1977, S 38. W. Bienert behandelt in seinem in der vorigen Anmerkung genannten Aufsatz diese Frage nicht als besonderes Problem, geht vielmehr ohne weiteres von der Einheit des ganzen Werkes aus.

[3] A. van Haarlem, *Incarnatie en Verlossing bij Athanasius*, Wageningen 1961, SS 74ff.

[4] A. Louth, The Concept of the Soul in Athanasius' Contra Gentes-De Incarnatione, *Studia Patristica* XIII,2, Berlin 1975, SS 227ff. Ders., Reason and Revelation in Saint Athanasius, *Scottish Journal of Theology* (23), 1970, SS 385ff.

[5] In der Zeilenangabe folgen wir der Ausgabe von R.W. Thomson: *Athanasius: Contra Gentes and De Incarnatione*, Oxford 1971.

[6] Siehe Irenäus, *Adv. Haer.* (ed. Harvey). 2,8,1: ... omnibus hominibus ad hoc demum consentientibus, veteribus quidem, et in primis a primoplasti traditione hanc suadelam

custodientibus et unum Deum fabricatorem coeli et terrae hymnizantibus: reliquis autem post eos a prophetis Dei huius rei commemorationem accipientibus; ethnicis vero ab ipsa conditione discentibus. Ipsa enim conditio ostendit eum qui condidit eam; et ipsa factura suggerit eum qui fecit; et mundus manifestat eum qui se disposuit. Ecclesia autem omnis per universum orbem hanc accepit ab apostolis traditionem.

[7] Siehe E.P. Meijerings Kommentar, S. 286ff.

2343 TX *Oegstgeest*, Ridderspoorlaan 103

Vigiliae Christianae 45 (1991), 327-346, E. J. Brill, Leiden

THE PERSECUTOR'S ENVY AND THE RISE OF THE MARTYR CULT: *PERISTEPHANON* HYMNS 1 AND 4[1]

BY

J. PETRUCCIONE

Amico amantissimo
Tom Lane, invidiae experti

The first and fourth hymns of Prudentius' *Peristephanon* have never been the object of a comparative analysis, yet the two share many points of similarity. Both describe an attempt by the pagan persecutor to limit the glory of his Christian victims. In *Peristephanon* 1, the Roman judge takes careful steps to destroy all memory of the sufferings of the soldier martyrs, Emeterius and Chelidonius, and in *Peristephanon* 4, the *barbarus tortor* (121) restrains his blood lust and denies the coup de grâce to the savagely tortured virgin confessor, Encratis. In both, Prudentius attributes the persecutor's cunning precautions to envy. Though brief, these references to envy would have aroused in the poet's audience a chain of associations established in earlier martyr literature and popular ethical treatises and thus adumbrated the theological depths of the simple poetic narratives. I believe that modern critics have failed to explicate important dramatic, ethical, and theological themes shared by these poems and to show how the different parts of each hymn contribute to a coherent vision precisely because they have misinterpreted the reference to envy in *Peristephanon* 1 and ignored those in *Peristephanon* 4. A careful investigation of the persecutor's envious activity, its immediate and ultimate targets, its methods, and its effects, whether desired or unforseen, will enable us to understand how the events described, both the martyr passion and the cult of the poet's own day, fit into a grand conception of salvation history.[2]

I. *Peristephanon* 1[3]

After an introduction celebrating their powerful intercession in heaven, Prudentius' hymn in honor of Sts. Emeterius and Chelidonius

of Calagurris (Calahorra) falls into two main sections: the first describing the martyrs' death (22-93), and the second (94-120), the feast celebrated in their hometown during Prudentius' lifetime. As we shall see, the one explicit reference to envy, usually interpreted as no more than an aside, is designed to emphasize the connection between these two epochs, between the passion of the martyrs and the struggle of the present-day Christian to preserve his spiritual identity in a world subject to alien powers.

According to Prudentius, the devoted companions Emeterius and Chelidonius were courageous Roman soldiers.[4] When the emperor proclaimed an edict requiring sacrifice to the pagan idols (40-42), the two decided that they should choose God over Caesar (61-63). In a defiant address to their comrades-in-arms, they first announced their refusal to honor the powers of darkness (58-63) and then stripped themselves of their hard-won decorations for valor (64-66). Even as they spoke, they were haled off to torture and prison (70-73). After a confinement of unspecified duration, they were brought out to their execution (79-81). At their death, a miracle signified that their souls had gained immediate access to heaven. The crowd beheld a ring belonging to the one and a handkerchief belonging to the other floating skyward on a cloud and vanishing in the heights of heaven (82-90).[5] Now, at the yearly feast of the soldier martyrs, numerous signs of their powerful intercession offer further proof that they have been received into God's presence (94-96). Through the martyrs' prayers, demoniacs are exorcised in the sight of all. The devils are subjected to a just torture (103-08), which forces them to confess their identity and flee the bodies of those they torment (109-11), and people long subject to wasting diseases are suddenly cured (112-14). At the close of the hymn, the poet urges a chorus of mothers and young wives to sing a hymn of thanksgiving for the wonderful graces received (118-20).

In the midst of the passion narrative, Prudentius exclaims against the cunning envy of the persecutor, who deliberately destroyed the official acts of the passion in order to wipe out all remembrance of these events: *O vetustatis silentis obsoleta oblivio!*[6] / *Invidentur ista nobis fama et ipsa extinguitur, / chartulas blasfemus olim nam satelles abstulit, / ne tenacibus libellis erudita saecula / ordinem tempus modumque passionis proditum / dulcibus linguis per aures posterorum spargerent* (73-78). Like passages in other works of early martyr literature, these lines record an attempted *damnatio memoriae*, attribute this to envy, and

draw attention to the persecutor's apparently overwhelming force.[7]

Scholars have understood the first of these stanzas as a simple complaint for the loss of documentary sources, and the second as an admission of ignorance regarding the facts of the martyrdom.[8] Consequently, the phrase, *ut ferunt*, which introduces the subsequent account of the prodigies accompanying the martyrs' deaths, is understood to signify reliance on oral tradition and to suggest a certain reserve before this unverifiable and popular report: *Illius fidem figurans nube fertur anulus, / hic sui dat pignus oris ut ferunt orarium, / quae superno rapta flatu lucis intrant intimum* (85-87). Proponents of this interpretation, in effect, assume that Prudentius appreciated the superiority of documentary to oral sources and here implied a preference for the former.[9] Furthermore, it has been asserted that the paucity of material forced the poet to forego his typical indulgence in lengthy narrative and compose a relatively brief hymn virtually devoid of circumstantial detail.[10]

This literalist reading dissolves the organic connection between passion and cult. It is as though Prudentius, short on biographical material, decided to eke out a decent length by tacking on a description of the festival. While implicitly taxing a master rhetorician with lack of concern for thematic unity, it evinces, again implicitly, an unreflecting confidence in the poet's commitment to provide historically accurate accounts. It even presupposes that he had come to a quite modern evaluation of the relative worth of different kinds of sources. All these assumptions are, to say the least, debatable. It seems especially improbable that a poet committed to praising the martyrs would question, if only implicitly, the value of oral report even as he underscored the role of living voices in maintaining the martyrs' fame.[11]

I submit that Prudentius details the envious attempt of the *blasfemus satelles* to obscure the martyrs' heroic resistance only in order to emphasize the irresistible power of God's will to glorify His servants. The rest of the poem indicates how completely the persecutor's strategem, which one might expect to be the best calculated to achieve the desired result, actually failed in every respect. Despite his careful precautions to prevent just this, the Christian people celebrate the soldiers' triumph in song (*cf. dulcibus linguis*, 78 with *hymnite*, 118). Although the documentary record of the event that occurred long ago has perished, live voices regularly proclaim the martyrs' frequent and powerful acts of intercession in favor of the Christians who guard their relics (115-20). During the bygone days of the persecution, the soldiers

were alone in their rejection of the devil as they abandoned the dragon standards of the pagan emperor for the sign of the cross that subdued the dragon (34-36).[12] Now, in the sight of a Christian community, they cure unfortunate mortals suffering the many ills occasioned by demonic possession (97-114). Two died long ago, but through the cult, in which their heroic sacrifice is constantly remembered and their intercession invoked, many each day receive powerful assistance.

In fact, the fame of the martyrs has passed well beyond their homeland. As a result of the many benefits they confer on the living, Calagurris has become a renowned goal of pilgrimage. The martyrs' generous patronage of all who venerate them at their tomb, whether natives or foreigners, has made them patrons of the world and raised their city to an exalted status: *Exteri nec non et orbis huc colonus advenit, / fama nam terras in omnes percucurrit proditrix / hic patronos esse mundi quos precantes ambiant* (10-12).

The loss of the documentary records is, in the end, irrelevant, for Christ has written the soldiers' names in letters of gold on the heavens: *Scripta sunt caelo duorum martyrum vocabula, / aureis quae Christus illic adnotavit litteris* (1f). Here Prudentius is very likely referring to the encouragement Jesus offered the seventy(-two) missionaries after they returned from preaching throughout Israel (Lk. 10.17-20). Like these, Emeterius and Chelidonius command demons in the name of Christ. And, more importantly, the martyrs' names are inscribed in the book of life.[13] From the image of Christ writing to that of the women singing, the hymn, from beginning to end, emphasizes that the martyrs' fame has spread through time and space despite the machinations of envious cunning. Lines 73-78 function as a rhetorical foil highlighting the logical, yet surprising, connection between past and present, the passion narrative and the martyr feast; despite the destruction of the official acts, the death of the soldiers has given rise to a cult. God constantly increases the glory that the persecutor sought to extinguish; what human envy obstructed, divine grace has multiplied.

A brief consideration of lines 73-78 against the background of patristic diatribes against envy will further clarify both the meaning of these lines and the role of the persecutor's envy in the plot of the hymn. In the writings of the third- and fourth-century fathers, one again and again encounters rhetorical variations on the theme of the futility and self-destructiveness of envy. St. Cyprian of Carthage warns an imaginary auditor that the object of his envy will certainly elude him:

quisque ille est quem zelo persequeris subterfugere et vitare te poterit. The envious man will harm himself rather than his enemy. In turning to his own loss the good of others, he submits himself to unceasing torture: *zelare in altero vel virtutem eius vel felicitatem id est ... inlustrium prosperitate torqueri, aliorum gloriam facere suam poenam, velut quosdam pectori suo admovere carnifices, cogitationibus et sensibus suis adhibere tortores qui se intestinis cruciatibus lacerent, qui cordis secreta malivolentiae ungulis pulsent.*[14] Sts. Basil and Gregory of Nyssa both compare the evil devisings of the envious to shafts that, when hurled against a victim, bounce off his protective armor and rebound to the injury of the aggressor.[15] The ultimate reason for this futility lies in the fact that envy constitutes an arrogant assault against the omnipotent will of God, who has chosen to bestow favor on another. Thus Cyprian exclaims, *Perseverans malum est hominem persequi ad Dei gratiam pertinentem, calamitas sine remedio est odisse felicem* (*De Zelo*, 9).[16] Indeed, the envious man has joined forces with the devil against God and the Church.[17] In a passage bearing a strong thematic similarity to *Peristephanon* 1, Peter Chrysologus, the eloquent fifth-century bishop of Ravenna, proclaims that, where the devil's envy tries to obstruct, the grace of God abounds: *Sed quid valet diabolus ad deum? Invidia quid valet ad dominicam caritatem? Invidit diabolus terram, sed donavit caelum deus; claves scientiae legis peritus sustulit* [*cf.* Lk. 12.52], *sed claves caelestis regni per Petrum largitus est Christus.*[18] All these texts of Christian ethical reflection undermine the prevailing interpretation of the complaint against the envious persecutor in *Peristephanon* 1, since that reading admits the effectiveness of the plot to destroy the memory of the martyrs' passion. Conversely, they reinforce my contention that the exclamation serves rather as a foil to set off in high relief the prevailing power of divine grace. In particular, the antitheses of Peter Chrysologus parallel the crescendo-like movement of the hymn: despite the envious assault on the soldiers' fame, it has grown to worldwide proportions. Two were wronged by the persecutor, but multitudes have been blessed by Christ's martyrs.

One might object that the fathers, like Peter Chrysologus in this very passage, sometimes concede a limited power to envy; after all, the devil did compass the fall (*invidit diabolus terram*) before God went far beyond merely restoring the loss and opened the door to heaven (*donavit caelum*). Could we not, our critic might ask, reconcile the prevailing interpretation of *Peristephanon* 1.73-78 with the preceding

exposition of the movement of the hymn as a whole and conclude that, although the persecutor destroyed all memory of the passion, the fame of the martyrs nonetheless spread far and wide solely because of their powerful intercession? While this may be what actually happened, I do not think it is what Prudentius means to say.

In his treatment of the *topos* of the futility of envy, the poet denies the persecutor even a limited success. The lines following the protest against the pagan's malice emphasize, not how much, but how little, envy has been able to conceal: *Hoc tamen solum vetusta subtrahunt silentia, / iugibus longum catenis an capillum paverint, / quo viros dolore tortor quave pompa ornaverit* (79-81). The poet admits that he cannot discover how long the martyrs were imprisoned or what tortures they suffered, but insists that their passion is known in all essentials.[19] Prudentius provides the very sequence of events (*ordinem*, 77)—the martyrs' renunciation of Caesar for Christ, the speech to their pagan *commilitones*, the rejection of their military decorations, their torture and imprisonment, the execution and the accompanying portents—that the persecutor wished forgotten. This *ordo*, of course, consists mainly of *topoi* appropriate to the portrayal of military martyrs and does not merit consideration as an historical account. But Prudentius does not advise us where he is relating historical fact and where he is deploying the *topoi* of martyr narratives.[20]

Prudentius wishes his audience to conclude that the persecutor's envy proved entirely ineffective. Not only did it fail to prevent the fame of the martyrs from spreading; it could not even suppress the salient facts of the passion.[21] Having taken up a position beside the devil and against the Lord, the persecutor expended all his malicious cunning in vain; the intended victims, *i.e.*, the martyrs, their posthumous fame, and, as we shall see, the Christian people of Calagurris, eluded him. We must, therefore, re-evaluate the usual translation of line 74: *Invidentur ista nobis fama et ipsa extinguitur.* Thomson's "We are denied the facts about these matters, the very tradition is destroyed" is misleading.[22] The principal fault lies in his rendering of *extinguitur*; this imperfective form makes sense only if interpreted as bearing a conative tone.[23] In addition, a better rendering of *invidentur* would bring out the reference to the persecutor's demonic envy. I suggest, 'We are enviously begrudged the facts, and the flame of renown is in the process of (*i.e.*, in danger of) being doused.' These lines state the goal, not the accomplishments, of the persecutor.

Now that we have established the rhetorical, rather than the historical, significance of these lines, we can better appreciate the unity of the poem. As we have seen, the exorcisms are fruits of the martyr cult, which could take root only because the persecutor's malice was counteracted by God's will to glorify His servants. But the relationship between passion and exorcism is not just one of cause and effect; they are fundamentally identical, for each of these, the one-time event and the repeated rite, represents the same triumph of God's gracious will to save over the devil's envious desire to harm that underlies all the events of salvation history, both those that have taken place in the past and those that encourage the church of the present.[24]

Prudentius does not explicitly ascribe the sufferings of the martyrs or the possession of his contemporaries to envy, but the *invidentur* of line 74 sets in train a series of associations. Fourth-century Christians knew that "through the devil's envy, death has entered the world, and all those who imitate him belong to his alliance."[25] The often repeated teaching that the devil aroused the persecutions of the past and continues to unleash the powers of sin in the present would encourage Prudentius' audience to descry the devil's envy not only in the failed *damnatio memoriae* but also in the pagan magistrate's execution of the soldiers and the assaults of the demons on the people of Calagurris. In other words, the poet's audience would instinctively grasp the opposing typologies: devil-persecutor-demons, sin vs. Christ-martyr-ordinary Christian, virtue.[26] In addition, the audience/reader acquainted with Prudentius' imagery would recognize references to envy in the metaphors—enslaving the free, sullying the clean, and holding low those who desire to rise on high—which describe the activities of the malevolent forces in *Peristephanon* 1.

Since Prudentius conceives of the devil as a tyrant, who has usurped the rule of man from God and control of the world from man,[27] he naturally speaks of envious powers enslaving or confining the free. In the evening hymn (*C.* 5), the poet retells the story of the exodus: The Hebrews fleeing Egypt were at last enjoying the freedom (*iam liber*, 40) that was once the right of their noble race (37) when Pharaoh, seething with envious gall (*invido / fervens felle*, 45f) reneged on his promise to release Israel. Only God's miraculous intervention at the Red Sea put an end to the king's tyrannical pretensions (*arcis iustitium triste tyrannicae*, 80).[28] In *Peristephanon* 1, the martyrs' passion flows from a declaration of independence. They renounce their past service of the

devil in the army of a pagan emperor and choose to enlist in the eternal army of Christ (34-36). Now, Christians rely on Emeterius and Chelidonius to release the possessed from the demons that the soldiers once renounced (97-111). The pagan emperor was quick to challenge the martyrs' declaration. This worldly power (*ductor aulae mundialis*, 41) ordered them to sacrifice to idols, an act that would have removed them from membership among the elect of Israel and degraded them to slaves of the world and mammon (40, 58f). The "persecution armed with the sword was pressing hard on the freedom of the faith."[29] By their suffering and death, however, the two defended from the devil, the world, and sin the freedom they had claimed as soldiers of Christ. Now, they free those deprived of their autonomy by demons, who have invaded their minds (98f). The martyrs turn the tables by releasing the possessed and binding the unclean spirits: *His modis spurcum latronem martyrum virtus quatit, / haec coercet torquet urit, haec catenas incutit* (106f).[30] In the day-to-day struggle to assert their freedom as children of God, Christians who have renounced the devil in baptism can rely on the timely aid of the martyrs.

Quite often Prudentius characterizes envious activity as the corroding, darkening, or soiling of the bright, the pure, the clean. Dark envy once stained (*decolor illum inficit invidia, H.* 186f) the limpid texture of Satan's soul (*primo generis de fonte serenus, ib.* 185). Now, the devil, himself black with envy (*atri livor hostis, C.* 7.201), wants to prevent fasting Christians from paring from their hearts the corrosive rust of carnal desire (*ib.* 201-10).[31] In our hymn, if Emeterius and Chelidonius had obeyed the command to sacrifice to black idols (*idolis litare nigris*, 42), they would not only have enslaved themselves to mammon and the powers of sin but also corrupted the image of God imprinted on the redeemed soul at baptism (58f).[32] They rejected the command, which they regarded as an order to defile themselves: *Absit ut caelestis ignis se tenebris misceat* (60). Now, the soldiers exert God's fiery strength against the filthy demons inhabiting men: *spurcum latronem martyrum virtus quatit. / haec coercet torquet urit* (106f). The verb *miscere* used to describe the way these dark powers insinuate themselves into the rational faculties of the possessed, recalls the imagery of the darkness of idolatry that threatened to becloud the martyrs' souls: *strangulant [daemones] mentes et ipsas seque miscent sensibus* (99). We conclude that the expulsion of the powers of evil restores to the faithful the same spiritual brightness that death for the faith preserved to the

martyrs themselves. The exorcism, like the martyrdom, defends from these powers the purity achieved through the renunciation of sin at baptism. This spiritual purity manifests itself even in physical forms. Through the martyrs' prayers, bodies pale with fever, livid with chills, or disfigured with tumors reacquire their normal healthy appearance (112-14).

Finally, Prudentius repeatedly portrays envy as a force that holds low those who wish to rise. This spatial metaphor is often connected with imagery of confinement, as in *Peristephanon* 13, where the envious persecutor (66) buries the heavenbound (41-43) Cyprian in a cave so deep that it "knows the darkness of hell" (*conscia tartareae caliginis*, 52).[33] In *Peristephanon* 1, the freedom and purity defended in martyrdom enabled the souls of Emeterius and Chelidonius to rise to heaven, where their Lord presides over His white-robed cohorts (67). The persecutor had imprisoned them and weighted them down with chains on their necks and wrists that doubtless prevented them from raising in prayer either hands or eyes (71f).[34] Unwittingly, however, he freed them for their ascent by beheading them. The ring and handkerchief that were seen rising to heaven embodied their spirits borne aloft to God (*in deum relatos hostiarum spiritus*, 96).

The present-day Christians in the grip of demonic possession (*strangulant*, 99) are subject to nether spirits. But by the martyrs' intervention, each is released from the inhabitant of hell (*gehennae ... incola*, 111) who has been holding him. Will they now imitate the martyrs' ascent? Prudentius does not say so, but this is implicit in the parallelism between the events of the passion and those of the cult. Long ago, the martyrs defeated the persecutor's attempt to enslave them, defile them, and hold them down. Now, the Christians, who, through the martyrs' intervention, have seen their freedom and purity restored, can likewise hope to follow their patrons to heaven. Prudentius draws out this final parallel in the inscription composed for the baptistry built on the site of the martyrdom: *Qui cupit aeternum caeli conscendere regnum, / huc veniat sitiens, ecce parata via est. / Ante coronati scandebant ardua testes / atria, nunc lotae celsa petunt animae* (*Pe.* 8.7-10).

It should now be entirely clear why Prudentius asserts that the persecutor envied us the facts of the martyrdom. It was not so much to conceal from future generations the facts themselves—though he failed even at that. Rather, his actions were calculated to prevent the rise of a cult, the opening of a channel of grace. Although the Roman

magistrate himself may not have understood exactly what was at stake, his master, the envious tyrant of this age, could foresee that numerous Christians throughout time would repeat the experience of the soldier-martyrs. As the two heroes once renounced the devil and hastened to the side of the Lord in heaven, their townsmen, indeed all Christians who appealed to their intercession, would exorcise the powers of sin, throw off the devil's yoke, and regain their identity as soldiers of Christ.

II. *Peristephanon* 4[35]

Once we have discerned the dynamic of divine grace overwhelming demonic envy, we have grasped the fundamental similarity of most narratives of *Peristephanon*. If we keep this dichotomy before us, we will also recover a sharper consciousness of the typology linking the various epochs and actors in the history of salvation, a typology that for the Christian of Prudentius' time was so widely presupposed as to be beyond the need of explicit exposition. And the clear apprehension of this typology facilitates a heightened appreciation of the dramatic irony pervading the hymns. The poet and his Christian audience enjoy a privileged vantage point afforded by their understanding of history from Adam to the present. From this summit, they can survey individual events within a vast context and descry the consequences of persecution that remain hidden to the minions of the devil, who always suffer defeat even when they seem to have triumphed.[36] The judge of *Peristephanon* 1 made the spread of the martyrs' fame more difficult, but, therefore, more wonderful; in the end, he succeeded only in helping to propagate among future generations the conviction, shared by very few in his own day, that Emeterius and Chelidonius numbered among the elect of heaven. In *Peristephanon* 4, we shall find the same play of dramatic irony as a cunning persecutor produces effects opposite to those he purposed. While in *Peristephanon* 1 the historical context stretches from the martyrs' day to the poet's present, the vision of *Peristephanon* 4 extends from the epoch of persecution to the *eschaton*.

Like the passion narrative of *Peristephanon* 1, the verses celebrating the virgin Encratis (*Pe.* 4.109-44) detail what, at first sight, seems a victory of envious malice.[37] These figure in the context of a hymn celebrating the church of Caesaraugusta (Saragossa), which had displayed exemplary fortitude under successive persecutions. In addition to her eighteen martyrs, a number exceeding that of all but the

greatest churches (57-64), this community could claim several confessors, whose constancy had been severely tested. Among these was the maiden Encratis, who survived terrible laceration with flesh hooks. The torturers continued their work until they had torn off one of her breasts. Although they struck close to the heart (*corde sub ipso*, 124), they evidently took care not to pierce that vital organ. The graceful movement of the sapphic strophe contrasts sharply with the gruesome realism of the description: *Barbarus tortor latus omne carpsit, / sanguis inpensus, lacerata membra, / pectus abscisa patuit papilla / corde sub ipso* (121-24). The envious persecutor, henchman of the spirit of violent rebellion (*efferati / spiritum mundi*, 110f), intended to deny Encratis the glorious title, 'martyr.' He, therefore, stayed the blow that would have taken her temporal, and conferred eternal, life: *Invidus quamvis obitum supremum / persecutoris gladius negarit* (133f).[38] The wounds were allowed to heal, and the abused body long presented a monument to the corrosive, disfiguring effects of envy; a raw scar sealed only the surface of the flesh, which putrefied within and afflicted her with sharp pains like those caused by poison (*venenatos ... dolores*, 126) or fire (*dolor ... ardens*, 130).

In the torture inflicted on the virgin through the human intermediary, the *barbarus tortor*, we can discern the bite of the snake who envied the happiness of Adam. The same language suggestive of heat and poison is used to describe the devil's malice in the narrative of the fall in *Hamartigenia: tristis ferus, insidiator, / vertice sublimis, cinctum cui nubibus atris / anguiferum caput et fumo stipatur et igni. / Liventes oculos suffundit felle perusto / invidia inpatiens iustorum gaudia ferre* (129-33). The bitter substance of envy that afflicted the devil at the sight of God fashioning man in His likeness (*decolor illum / inficit invidia stimulisque instigat amaris, ib.* 186f) must be the poison that entered through the gashes caused by the flesh hooks and inflicted such bitter pain on the heroic virgin (*taetra quam sulcos habeant amaros / vulnera narras, Pe.* 4.119-20).[39]

Nevertheless, the devil and his human intermediary failed, despite all their precautions, to prevent the martyrdom. In this poem, in contrast to *Peristephanon* 1, the poet does not leave the audience to infer the futility of envy. The stanza beginning with the persecutor's malice (133f) ends with the virgin's triumph: *plena te, martyr, tamen ut peremptam / poena coronat* (135f). Prudentius here reflects the widespread conviction that it is the unshakeable spiritual commitment to suf-

fer all for the faith, and not the fact of death itself, that constitutes true martyrdom. As Cyprian had explained to the clergy of Carthage during the Decian persecution, *Qui se tormentis et morti sub oculis Dei optulit passus est quidquid pati voluit.*[40]

What is more, by consigning Encratis to a life of perpetual pain, the magistrate prolonged the tortures far beyond those experienced by most martyrs and so conferred on her an honor exceeding that of conventional martyrdom: *Iam minus mortis pretium peractae est, / quae venenatos abolens dolores / concitam membris tribuit quietem / fine soporo* (125-28). As Rainer Henke has shown in his discussion of the hymn to St. Romanus (*Pe.* 10), Prudentius shared the conviction, often expressed in earlier martyr literature, that God would reward the heroes of the faith in proportion to the intensity of their sufferings.[41] The ambiguity of *pretium* in line 125 (both 'price' and 'reward') is likely intentional; the poet alludes to the singularity of both Encratis' suffering and her reward.[42] The latter began even before death, for she was honored with the title, martyr, while still living. Encratis' prolonged tortures were so dreadful that the faithful could not but set aside in her case the normal distinction between living confessor and dead martyr (113-16).

Furthermore, a part of Encratis actually did die. In the course of her passion, the torturers ripped out a piece of her liver, which Prudentius perhaps saw among the relics of the local basilica: *Vidimus partem iecoris revulsam / ungulis longe iacuisse pressis, / mors habet pallens aliquid tuorum / te quoque viva* (136-40). Lavarenne suggests that the noun *iecur* may refer, not to Encratis' entrails, but to the severed breast mentioned in line 123.[43] But such an extended use of the term seems unexampled. Elsewhere, *iecur* denotes a region situated deep within (*Pe.* 5.115f and 11.57f), the seat of life and feeling (*C.* 9.48). The *iecur* houses unruly passions (*Ps.* 238; 2*S.* 631) but piety as well (*ib.* 1047f). It can be made to submit to the rule of reason (*ib.* 631). This organ deep within, the seat of all sentience, seems indistinguishable from the heart. In fact, Prudentius uses the two as parallel terms.[44] The persecutor, who spared the martyr's heart, nonetheless, severed her *iecur*; although he kept her alive, he, in a sense, inadvertently killed her. The piece of liver caught in the tongs is palpable evidence that Encratis gave her life to God.

By delaying her death, the persecutor not only increased the value of Encratis' offering and reward; he also increased the celebrity of her cult

and of the city that hosts it. Only Caesaraugusta can claim to be the home of a 'living martyr': *Hunc novum nostrae titulum fruendum / Caesaraugustae dedit ipse Christus, / iuge viventis domus ut dicata / martyris esset* (141-44). The language and sentiments of this stanza remind us of the opening lines of *Peristephanon* 1, where Prudentius insists that the martyr cult is the principal glory of the city. If a spiritual kinship to Emeterius and Chelidonius constitutes a God-given stemma of nobility for Calagurris (*Pollet hoc felix per orbem terra Hibera stemmate*, 4), Christ, through Encratis' living presence, has conferred a new and unheard-of distinction on Caesaraugusta (*Hunc novum ... titulum*, 141).[45]

But *Peristephanon* 4 is unique among the hymns of the cycle in its concentration on the Christian community as a whole. The first hymn does indicate the ecclesial significance of the passion of the soldier martyrs, who have become intercessors for Christians of subsequent ages. But we are invited to concentrate on the conversion and cure of individuals; the two martyrs complete their conversion to Christ through their passion and then cure numerous individual Christians afflicted by the powers of sin and disease. In *Peristephanon* 4, the focus is on collectivities: Encratis is one of a numerous band of martyrs that creates the church of Caesaraugusta by the sacrifice of blood and then intercedes for that community as a whole at the last judgement. To grasp the full significance of Encratis' victory over the envious persecutor, the reader must follow Prudentius in his survey of the history of this Christian community from its foundation to the final and terrible day of accounting.

The poet boldly avers that it was the blood of the martyrs that first cleansed of demons the erstwhile pagan city: *Omnibus portis sacer inmolatus / sanguis exclusit genus invidorum / daemonum et nigras pepulit tenebras / urbe piata. / Nullus umbrarum latet intus horror, / pulsa nam pestis populum refugit; / Christus in totis habitat plateis, / Christus ubique est* (65-72). Through the sacrificial shedding of their blood, Encratis and the other martyrs of the city drove out the envious powers of darkness and thereby redeemed their townspeople in a way analogous to Christ's redemption of the entire race. While Christ offered Himself for all humanity, the martyrs died on behalf of their own people.[46]

The poet invites us to contemplate not only the foundation of this Christian church but also its salvation as a corporate entity at the end

of time. As Encratis' blood helped drive the envious demons away in the distant past, so her relics will guard the city on that last day. In a vivid eschatological vision unique among the hymns of *Peristephanon*, Prudentius imagines a grand *theoria* of the cities of his world, Spain, northern Africa, southern Gaul. As Christ returns in glory to judge, each city personified as a dignified matron, rushes to greet the Lord with her martyrs' relics, gifts calculated to conciliate His mercy (9-16). The martyrs will be the guarantors (*pignere*) of the eternal felicity of their townspeople (49-52).

It is this awareness of the importance of the martyrs' intercesson for the salvation of their homeland that underlies the poet's eagerness to lay claim to additional patrons for the already richly provided city: the deacon Vincent, though he died far off in a little-known city (89-100),[47] Gaius and Crementius who, though confessors rather than martyrs, *ambo gustarunt leviter saporem / martyriorum* (187f), and the maiden Encratis, who lived beyond her own death (115f).[48] Conversely, when we look forward to the last judgement, we can better understand why the envious persecutor spared the virgin's life. The devil wishes to deprive Christian communities of powerful patrons in order to prevent them from escaping the consequences of their transgressions and gaining heaven. We conclude that the envious Roman judge, who may have seen no further than the suffering of a steadfast virgin, was serving, even if unwittingly, the devil, who envied man his original closeness and similarity to God and is constantly devising means to prolong his tyranny.

But Encratis has already triumphed twice over the devil's envy: the first time in her own ascent to heaven (135f) and the second, when she and her fellow martyrs opened the way to Christ by driving the demons of idolatry from Caesaraugusta. We can, therefore, be confident that in the final judgement, the devil's envy will again prove futile, and this community will receive grace rather than condemnation. *Sola in occursum numerosiores / martyrum turbas domino parasti, / sola praedives pietate multa / luce frueris* (57-60). Thanks to the many martyrs, who long ago dispelled the darkness with which the envious demons had enveloped the city, the community will enjoy abundant light in the age to come. Encratis was one of this troop, more numerous than her persecutor had ever desired or even suspected.

In both hymns one and four, the poet plays variations on a theme, which appears on occasion in earlier martyr literature: the persecutor's

attempt to smother the posthumous renown of his victims. But Prudentius always places this malice in a broad historical perspective. Brief verbal allusions or pictoral imagery serve to remind the poet's audience that, however blind he may be to the true facts of the situation, the persecutor is assisting the devil in his envious assault on human dignity. The defeat of the persecutor's malice and the establishment of the martyr cult thus reflect a process of salvation, which the mind enlightened by revelation may observe throughout sacred history and in the daily life of present-day believers. Despite every cunning device and exertion of secular authority, the poet and his contemporaries now enjoy the powerful assistance of invisible patrons as they struggle each day to escape the toils of sin and death, to realize completely the exalted status once offered to Adam and to which they, as Christians, have been called in baptism. It is this broad historical and soteriological vision that confers on the hymns of *Peristephanon* both theological and dramatic depth. Endowed with a vision that penetrates the surface of events, the poet's listeners would perhaps laugh as they considered the profound irony animating these narratives in which God's seemingly defenceless elect triumph over the apparently formidable, but ultimately futile, powers of this age.[49]

NOTES

[1] In this paper I make reference to the following editions, commentaries, and translations of Prudentius: F. Arévalo, *Aurelii Prudentii necnon Dracontii Carmina Omnia* vol. 2, Rome, 1789: reprinted in *PL* 60. M. C. Eagan, *The Poems of Prudentius* (= *The Fathers of the Church*, 43), vol. 1, Washington, 1962. M. Lavarenne, *Prudence*, vol. 4: *Le Livre des Couronnes, Dittochaeon, Épilogue* (= Coll. des Universités de France), Paris, 1951. H. J. Thomson, *Prudentius* (= The Loeb Classical Library), vol. 2, London, Cambridge Mass., 1953. I cite the text of Prudentius according to the edition of M. P. Cunningham, *Aurelii Prudentii Clementis Carmina* (= Corpus Christianorum, Ser. Lat., 126), Turnholt, 1966. *C.* = *Cathemerinon, A.* = *Apotheosis, H.* = *Hamartigenia, S.* = *Contra Symmachum Libri Duo*, and *Pe.* = *Peristephanon*. Translations of Prudentius, unless otherwise indicated, are Thomson's.

[2] In this paper, I am continuing my researches on the meaning of envy in the works of Prudentius. For a brief discussion of the ways in which Prudentius reflects both pagan and Christian ideas on envy that were current in the fourth century, *v.* J. Petruccione, "The Persecutor's Envy and the Martyr's Death in *Peristephanon* 13 and 7," forthcoming in *Sacris Erudiri* 34 (1991).

[3] On *Pe.* 1 *v.* J. Fontaine, "Démons et sibylles: la peinture des possédés dans la poésie de Prudence," *Hommages à Jean Bayet* (= Coll. Latomus 70), ed. M. Renard and R. Schilling, Brussels, 1964, pp. 196-213. Fontaine argues that Prudentius' description of the possessed (100f) recalls Lucan's portrait of the sibyl Phemonoe (*Ph.* 5.186ff):

"[Prudence] a voulu montrer dans les possédés comme les derniers et misérables héritiers des prêtresses d'Apollon, tour à tour martyrisés par Satan et par la puissance des martyrs, eux-mêmes" (p. 213). Most recently A.-M. Palmer (*Prudentius on the Martyrs*, Oxford, 1989, pp. 140-54) has read *Pe.* 1 as a programmatic piece presenting a Christian redefinition of the Roman concept of *virtus.* She draws many illuminating comparisons with Hor., *Od.* 3.2 and 3.5 to which she believes that *Pe.* 1 makes repeated allusion.

[4] *Pe.* 1 is our earliest source for the events. The post-Prudentian passion (*BHL* 2533) merely elaborates the plot of the hymn with inauthentic biographical data; the two saints are made into brothers and their unit is stationed at Léon. A turbid and bombastic piece, its composition must predate the death of St. Eulogius of Córdova, who quoted it in the ninth century. For a discussion of the date of composition, *v.* Á. Fábrega Grau, *Pasionario Hispánico* (= Monumenta Hispaniae Sacra, Serie Litúrgica, 6), Madrid-Barcelona, 1953, pp. 122-23. In *ib.*, vol. 2, (Madrid-Barcelona, 1955, pp. 238-43), Fábrega Grau has published the recension of this martyr story that appears in the tenth-century passional of the monastery of S. Pedro de Cardeña, now Addit. 25.600 in the British Library.

[5] For a discussion of the *topoi* from which this narrative is largely constructed, *v.* J. Petruccione, *Prudentius' Use of Martyrological* Topoi *in Peristephanon*, Univ. of Michigan Ph.D. dissertation, 1985, pp. 52-59.

[6] In l. 73 *obsoleta* 'sullied,' 'defiled' is an epithet transferred from some such noun as *fama* in the following line and applied to the force, *oblivio*, that produces the effect of sullying or defiling. *Cf.* the similar enallage in Ov., *Ex Ponto* 4.8.49: *Tabida consumit ferrum lapidemque vetustas* (Ovide, *Pontiques*, ed. J. André, Paris, 1977).

[7] The closest parallels are in the *Pass. S. Vincen. Mart.* (*V.* M. Simonetti, "Una redazione poco conosciuta della passione di S. Vincenzo," *RAC* 33 [1956], pp. 219-41) and in the *Mart. Poly.* In the first, the envious enemy (*invidus ... inimicus*, ch. 1) did not wish the story of Vincent's martyrdom to be written down, and the second (ch. 17f), the envious devil ('Ο ... ἀντίζηλος καὶ βάσκανος καὶ πονηρός) attempted to minimize Polycarp's victory by preventing the burial of his corpse. *Cf.* also *Mart. Lugdun.* 1.57-63; Eus., *H.E.* 8.6.7; Dam., *Ep. in hon. SS. Marcel. et Petr.* (= 28 in *Epigrammata Damasiana*, ed. A. Ferrua, Rome, 1942.

[8] Thus, P. Franchi De' Cavalieri ("Intorno ad alcune Reminiscenze Classiche nelle Leggende Agiografiche del Secolo IV," *StT* 19 [1908], p. 134) remarks, "Prudenzio confessa ignorarsi intieramente la storia del martirio." *V.* also Á. Fábrega Grau (note 4 above) p. 120, M. Pellegrino, *Peristephanon di Prudenzio*, Turin, 1958, p. 30, and P. T. A. Sabattini, "Storia e Leggenda nei *Peristephanon* di Prudenzio," *RSC* 21 (1973), p. 41.

[9] *E.g.* A.-M. Palmer (note 3 above) declares (p. 239) that "Prudentius admits reliance on oral tradition." *V.* also *ib.*, 152 and Thomson's (note 1 above) introductory comment (pp. 98f) to *Pe.* 1.

[10] F. Ermini (*Peristephanon: Studi Prudenziani*, Rome, 1914, pp. 165f) following A. Puech (*Prudence, Étude sur la Poésie Latine au IVè Siècle*, Paris, 1888, pp. 137-39) states that it was precisely ignorance of the facts that induced Prudentius to present the heroes as the embodiment of a type of excellence rather than as actors in a narrative poem.

[11] For a case study of Prudentius' hagiographical method, *v.* J. Petruccione, "Prudentius' Portrait of St. Eulalia of Mérida," *AnBoll* 108 (1990), pp. 81-104. While *ut ferunt* in l. 86 probably refers to oral report, this is not necessarily the case. In a recent study of forms of reference ("Virgil and the illusory footnote," *Papers of the Leeds Interna-*

tional Latin Seminar, 6, [1990], pp. 49-63), N. Horsfall has found no case where Virgil uses this or similar locutions to distinguish oral from written sources; such phrases emphasize rather the traditional nature of the information. In some contexts they suggest that Virgil declines responsibility for unverifiable information relating to the distant past, but in others they serve to enhance the impression of reliability by conferring the authority of antiquity. *V.* Horsfall's discussions of *Aen.* 8.324 (p. 51) and 3.414 (p. 53). In *Pe.* 1, far from betraying diffidence, *ut ferunt* probably underscores the celebrity of the tradition. Everyone in present-day Calagurris knows about the miracle, because everyone, including the executioner, observed it during the martyrdom (91-93). For forms of *ut ferunt* used to emphasize the widespread dissemination, rather than the dubiousness, of information, *v.* Cic., *De Orat.* 1.45, 1.49, and 2.270; *Ad Atticum* 7.2.8; Sulp. Sev., *Vita Mart.* 5.3 and 6.5.

[12] *Caesaris vexilla linquunt, eligunt signum crucis / proque ventosis draconum quos gerebant palliis / praeferunt insigne lignum quod draconem subdidit.*

[13] *Cf., e.g.*, Dan. 12.1, Heb. 12.23, and Apoc. 3.5.

[14] *De Zelo et Livore*, 9 and 7. All quotations of this treatise follow *S. Thasci Caecili Cypriani Opera Omnia* (= CSEL, vol. 3, part 1), ed. G. Hartel, Vienna, 1868. *V.* also *ib.*, 3; Basil, *Or.* 11.1; Ioh. Chrysos., *Sermo* 37.3; Peter Chrys., *Sermo* 172.2.

[15] Ὥσπερ γὰρ τῶν βελῶν τὰ βιαίως φερόμενα, ἐπειδὰν καρτερῷ τινι καὶ ἀντιτύπῳ προσπέσῃ, ἐπὶ τὸν προέμενον (53) ἐπανέρχεται · οὕτω καὶ τὰ τοῦ φθόνου κινήματα, οὐδὲν λυποῦντα τὸν βασκαινόμενον, αὐτοῦ πληγαὶ γίνονται τοῦ βασκάνου. Τίς γὰρ λυπούμενος ἠλάττωσέ ποτε τὰ τοῦ πλησίον καλά; (*Or.* 11.4, PG 31, col. 380); *V.* also Greg. Nyss., *Vita Moysis* 259-62. In "*Invidia Rumpantur Pectora*: The Iconography of *Phthonos/Invidia* in Greco-Roman Art," *JbAC* 26 (1983), pp. 1-37, K. M. D. Dunbabin and M. W. Dickie collect (pp. 11-16) many classical as well as late-antique literary and epigraphic descriptions of the self-destructiveness of envy.

[16] *V.* also *ib.*, 6; Basil, *Or.* 11.3; Ioh. Chrysos., *In Rom. hom.* 7.5.

[17] *V., e.g.*, Cypr., *De Zelo* 4; Basil, *Or.* 11.3; Ioh. Chrysos., *In Rom. hom.* 7.5. This idea is the postulate underlying all patristic discussions of envy. *V.* the references collected in note 8 of J. Petruccione, "The Persecutor's Envy," etc. (note 2 above).

[18] *Sermo* 172.4, *Sancti Petri Chrysologi Collectio Sermonum* (= Corpus Christianorum, Ser. Lat. 24A-24B), ed. A. Olivar, Turnholt 1982.

[19] A.-M. Palmer (note 3 above) also remarks (p. 152) that "the poet is keen to emphasize how much *is* remembered." *V.* also *ib.*, p. 238.

[20] I believe that Prudentius also tells us in ls. 91-93 how (*modumque passionis*, 77) the martyrs were killed: *Vidit hoc conventus adstans, ipse vidit carnifex / et manum repressit haerens ac stupore oppalluit, / sed tamen peregit ictum, ne periret gloria.* Of the four methods of execution in common use—beheading, burning, exposure to the beasts in the amphitheater, and crucifixion—the phrase *peregit ictum* can refer only to the first. For these four capital sentences *cf. Pe.* 1.49-51, 3.116-20, and P. Franchi De' Cavalieri, "San Lorenzo e il Supplizio della Graticola," *Römische Quartalschrift*, Supplementheft 10 (reprinted in *StT*, 221, 1962), 1899, p. 161. For the common use of *ictus* to denote sword blows that lop off limbs, *v. The Oxford Latin Dictionary*, ed. P. G. W. Glare, Oxford, 1982, *sub voce*, sec. 1. The portent of the handkerchief (*orarium*, 86) also points to decapitation. As Arévalo (note 1 above) commented (*ad* 86), those condemned to this, the most common method of execution, were often blindfolded with an *orarium*. To his exx.

add *Acta Cypr.* 5.5-6 and *Mart. Mont. et Luci* 15.2. Gregory of Tours (*De Gloria Mart.* 93) obviously understood this passage to refer to beheading.

[21] It is true that Prudentius nowhere specifies the time (*tempus*, 77), but the absence of this information hardly diminishes the realism of the narrative or sets it apart from other narratives of *Peristephanon*. *Pe.* 9, 11, and 14 likewise lack all indication of when the martyr suffered.

[22] M. Lavarenne's (note 1 above) translation, "Les détails nous sont refusés; la tradition même s'est éteinte" is also misleading, particularly in the use of the perfect in the second clause. M. C. Eagan (note 1 above) offers the much freer but equally overstated "O oblivion of the ages and the silence and neglect / *That to us denies the record of their glorious martyrdom*!" Lavarenne and Eagan agree in taking *chartulas* in 1.75 as referring only to the records of the trial. If this were the meaning of the word, we would have an additional argument against understanding 73-78 as an admission of ignorance. One does not need the official transcript of the trial to know the facts of the martyrdom. Thomson, however, is doubtless right in rendering *chartulas* with the more general "records," for the goal of the persecutor was to conceal not only what transpired at the trial but also *ordinem tempus modumque passionis* (77). *Cf.* the identical use of *chartulas* in *Pe.* 10.1111-15.

[23] For a discussion and numerous examples of this nuance in both the present and the past imperfective tenses, *v.* R. Kühner, *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*, 2nd ed., C. Stegman, vol. 2, part 1, *Satzlehre*, Hannover, 1912, pp. 120-22.

[24] *Cf.* the remarks of J. Fontaine (note 3 above), pp. 211f.

[25] Wis. 2.24. In *De Zelo* 4, Cyprian quotes this passage in the form: *invidia autem diaboli mors introivit in orbem terrarum. imitantur illum qui sunt ex parte eius.*

[26] *Pe.* 4.65-68 imply that the persecution results from the devil's envy; *cf.* 1 *S. pf.* 58. For his belief that moral trials may be attributed to the same source *v., e.g., C.* 7.201-05 and *H.* 129-48, 539-56. For further patristic witness to these widely held beliefs, *v.* G. J. M. Bartelink, "Misókalos, Épithète du Diable," *VigChr* 12 (1958), pp. 37-44 and J. Petruccione, "The Persecutor's Envy," etc. (note 2 above), notes 4-5.

[27] *V.* esp. *H.* 697-722, 378-436, 203-57. At *H.* 500 and 721, Prudentius uses the title, *tyrannus*. The concept of the devil's tyranny is, of course, central to patristic soteriology. *V.* J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, 4th ed., London, 1968, pp. 375-84, 387, 391f. For more exx. of the use of *tyrannus* and related terms applied to the devil in texts from the third through the fifth centuries, *v.* J. Petruccione, "The Persecutor's Envy" etc. (note 2 above), note 15.

[28] *V.* M. M. van Assendelft's note *ad loc.* in *Sol Ecce Surgit Igneus: A Commentary on the Morning and Evening Hymns of Prudentius*, Groningen, 1976. For envy enslaving the free, *v.* also *C.* 7.181-205 and *Pe.* 13.51-66.

[29] *Liberam succincta ferro pestis urgebat fidem* (43). On *pestis, v.* Lavarenne (note 1 above) *ad loc.*

[30] On the devil as *latro* (106) and *praedo* (108), *v.* V. Buchheit, "Göttlicher Heilsplan bei Prudentius (*Cath.* 11.25-48)," *VigChr* 44 (1990), p. 229.

[31] For more exx. of envy corroding, befouling, or darkening, *v. C.* 10.101f; *H.* 543-60; *Ps.* 668, 772-79; *Pe.* 10.486-89, 506-10.

[32] R. Herzog (*Die Allegorische Dichtkunst des Prudentius*, Munich, 1966 = Zetemata 42) explains (p. 21) that Prudentius here makes poetical use of a traditional exegesis of the pericope of the tribute money.

[33] For a particularly clear example of this imagery of high and low, *v.* Romanus' complaint against the envious (*Pe.* 10.391-94) judge Asclepiades: Whoever forces Christians to sacrifice to idols *vetat vigorem mentis alte intendere / nostrique acumen ignis ad terram vocat / nec excitari vim sinit prudentiae* (368-70). *V.* also *A.* 342-46, 526-28.

[34] *Cf. Pe.* 5.235f and 13.53f.

[35] B. Riposati ("La struttura degli Inni alle tre vergini martiri del *Peristephanon* di Prudenzio," *Paradoxos Politeia: Studi Patristici in onore di Giuseppe Lazzati*, ed. R. Cantalamessa and L. F. Pizzolato, Milan, 1979, pp. 25-41) offers the most recent treatment of the praise of St. Encratis in *Pe.* 4. He undertakes this comparative study in order to define the content and relative order of the themes that constitute what he takes to be the "modulo compositivo" employed in all the hymns of the cycle. *V.* esp. pp. 39f.

[36] *Cf. De Zelo* 6, where Cyprian describes envy blinding sinners (*zelo excaecante sensus nostros*), who lose sight of the most crucial facts of life: God's ethical demands, the Lordship of Christ, and the approach of the last judgement.

[37] *Pe.* 4 is our earliest source for both the eighteen martyrs of Saragossa and for Sts. Encratis, Gaius and Crementius, who are associated with them. There is a later passion, (dated by Fábrega Grau [vol. 1, pp. 170f] to the seventh century) dedicated to these twenty-one historical martyrs and confessors and to a group called the *Innumerabiles Martyres Caesaraugustani.* The legend of the *Innumerabiles* seems to have evolved from a misunderstanding of *numerosiores* in *Pe.* 4.57. In the listings of the *Mart. Rom.* for April 16th, the fictitious *Innumerabiles* appear along with Encratis, Gaius, Crementius, and the eighteen, and in the listings for November 3, they appear without their historical countrymen. D. Papebroch published an epitome of the *Passio Innumerab. Mart. Caesaraugustan.* in *Act. SS., Aprilis* t. 2, pp. 409f (= BHL 1506) and a longer and better recension in the appendix to this volume, pp. 960-62 (= BHL 1505). G. van Hoof published critical editions of two recensions in *Act. SS., Novembris* t. 1, pp. 643-49 (= BHL 1503-04 and 1505). *V.* vol. 2, pp. 371-78 of *Pasionario Hispánico* (note 4 above) for the recension of this legend read in the passional of the monastery of S. Pedro de Cardeña.

[38] The distinction between martyr and confessor appears explicitly for the first time in the letter of the churches of Lyons and Vienne of 177. *V.* H. Delehaye, *Sanctus: Essai sur le Culte des Saints dans l'Antiquité* (= Subsidia Hagiographica, 17) Brussels 1927, pp. 81f. For a discussion of the general belief in the immediate heavenly ascent of the martyrs, *v.* W. Hellmanns, *Wertschätzung des Martyriums als eines Rechtfertigungsmittels in der altchristlichen Kirche bis zum Anfange des Vierten Jahrhunderts*, Breslau, 1912, pp. 42f, 45, 51f, 60. Prudentius shared this view: *Pe.* 1.82-96; 3.161-75; 6.94-99, 121-29; 14.81-123.

[39] Riposati (note 35 above) mistakenly imagines (p. 28) that Encratis was counted among the eighteen martyrs of Caesaraugusta. This may explain why he overlooks Prudentius' allusions to the persecutor's envy.

[40] *Ep.* 12.1.2. The text of Cyprian's letters follows *Saint Cyprien, Correspondance*, ed. Le Chanoine Bayard, Paris, 1925. *V.* also *ib.*, 61.2.1; Tert., *Scorp.* 8.7f; Orig., *in Num. hom.* 10.2; Paul. Nol., *Carm.* 18.146-54; 21.140-64; H. von Campenhausen, *Die Idee des Martyriums in der alten Kirche*, 2nd ed., Göttingen, 1964, pp. 137f.

[41] *Studien zum Romanushymnus des Prudentius*, (= Europäische Hochschulschriften, Reihe 15: Klassische Sprache und Literaturen, 27) Frankfurt am Main, 1983, pp. 102-19.

[42] In Lavarenne's (note 1 above) translation, the ambiguity of 'prix' catches both nuances: "Une mort achevée a moins de prix ...".

[43] *Ad loc.* in the edition cited in note 1 above.

[44] The man who itches with a desire to reveal secrets, *scalpit iecur / scabiemque cordis sustinet* (*Pe.* 2.255f; *cf.* 10.13f). The *TLL ad voc.* II.A.1, ls. 14-17 lists *Pe.* 4.137, 5.116 and 11.58 as well as *C.* 9.48 under the rubric, *latiore sensu i.q. intestina, viscera sim. (praesertim tamquam sedes vitae ...)*. For the Roman view of the *praecordia* and the *iecur* as "the organs of consciousness" *v.* R. B. Onians, *The Origins of European Thought*, Cambridge, 1954, pp. 505-06; *cf.* pp. 84-89.

[45] Actually, the title, 'living martyr,' was applied to others besides Encratis. *V.* Greg. Naz., *Or.* 43.5, PG 36, col. 500. During the persecution of Maximin (235-38), Basil's ancestors all but laid down their lives καὶ μέχρι θανάτου διηγωνισμένοι, καὶ πρὸ θανάτου μικρόν· τοσοῦτον ἀπολειφθέντες, ὅσον ἐπιβιῶναι τῇ νίκῃ, καὶ μὴ συναπελθεῖν τοῖς παλαίσμασιν, ἀλλ' ὑπολειφθῆναι τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀλεῖπται (59) τῆς ἀρετῆς, ζῶντες μάρτυρες, ἔμπνοοι στῆλαι, σιγῶντα κηρύγματα. With Gregory's ἐπιβιῶναι τῇ νίκῃ *cf.* Prudentius' *morti propriae superstes* (*Pe.* 4.115).

[46] For the same soteriological conception of the martyr death *v.* also *Pe.* 4.45-48 and 2.465-72.

[47] *Cf. De Mart. Pal.* 2.5, where Eusebius insists that Romanus of Caesarea was a Palestinian martyr although he suffered in Antioch.

[48] In the entry for April 16, the *Mart. Rom.* states that Gaius and Crementius were martyred after a second confession. This information is clearly due to a misunderstanding of *Pe.* 4.181-88. *V.* Arévalo (note 1 above) *ad* 183, 185, and 187. The desire to invoke as many patrons as possible also underlies ls. 161-68, where Prudentius expresses his determination to include in the catalogue of Caesaraugustan martyrs the four Saturnini, despite the long a of the first syllable, which disrupts the Sapphic measure. Meter and poetic convention are ingeniously portrayed as foes to the glory of the Saturnini and implicitly likened to the persecutors who had Vincent killed far from home and then denied Encratis her martyr death. *V.* also C. Witke, *Numen Litterarum: The Old and the New in Latin Poetry from Constantine to Gregory the Great* (= Mittellateinische Studien und Texte, 5) Leiden, 1971, pp. 136-38. There is, perhaps, a contemporary parallel for deliberate contravention of the rules of prosody in the treatment of a person's name in *Gild.* 1.91. *V.* T. Birt's comment (p. CCXI) in *Claudii Claudiani Carmina*, Berlin, 1892 = MGH 10. N. Horsfall collects material on the faulty prosodic treatment of proper nouns in late authors in "*CIL* VI 37965 = *CLE* 1988 (Epitaph of Allia Potestas): A Commentary," *ZPE* 61 (1985), p. 263 (*ad* l. 21). For the name Saturninus, *v.* also Dam., *Ep.* 46.11a-b and Ferrua's (note 7 above) remarks *ad loc.*

[49] I wish to express my gratitude to Catherine Cooper (FAAR, 1990-1991) and to Prof. Nicholas Horsfall, whose careful criticisms have improved the organization of the discussion and saved me from errors of commission and omission.

The Catholic University of America

Vigiliae Christianae 45 (1991), 347-375, E. J. Brill, Leiden

LA VOIE D'IMMORTALITÉ À LA LUMIÈRE DES *HERMETICA* DE NAG HAMMADI ET DE DÉCOUVERTES PLUS RÉCENTES*

PAR

JEAN-PIERRE MAHÉ

Depuis la découverte, en 1946, d'*Hermetica* coptes, dans le codex VI de Nag Hammadi, d'autres écrits et fragments d'importance et de nouveauté inégales sont venus enrichir, en des langues diverses, l'ensemble des textes hermétiques traditionnellement connus, qui avaient pris place dans les éditions classiques de Scott-Ferguson (1929-1936) et Nock-Festugière (1945-1954).[1] Voici la liste de ces nouveaux textes.[2]

1. *L'Ogdoade et l'Ennéade*: *NH* VI, 52,1-63,32
Texte tout à fait nouveau
Krause (M.), Labib (P.) 1971, p. 170-184 (copte et trad. allemande): editio princeps
Mahé (J.-P.) 1978, *HHE* tome 1, p. 62-87 (copte et trad. française)
Dirkse (P.A.), Brashler (J.), Parrott (D.M.) 1979, p. 341-373 (copte et trad. anglaise)

2. *La Prière d'action de grâces*: *NH* VI, 63,33-65,7
Texte parallèle au grec du Papyrus Mimaut (Paris) et au latin d'*Asclepius* 41
Krause, Labib 1971, p. 185-186 (copte et trad. allemande)
Mahé 1978, *HHE* tome 1, p. 157-167 (copte et trad. française, grec, latin)
Dirkse, Brashler 1979, p. 375-387 (copte et trad. anglaise, grec, latin)

3. Extrait du *Discours Parfait* (*DP*): *NH* VI, 65,15-78,43
Texte parallèle au latin d'*Asclepius* 21-29 et au grec de deux courts fragments
Krause, Labib 1971, p. 187-206 (copte et trad. allemande)
Mahé 1982, *HHE* tome 2, p. 147-207
Dirkse, Parrott 1979, p. 395-451

4. *Papyri Vindobonenses Graecae* 29456 r et 29828 r: Fragments A et B
Textes tout à fait nouveaux

Oellacher (H.) 1951, p. 182-188: editio princeps
Mahé 1984, p. 51-64

5. En arménien, *Définitions d'Hermès Trismégiste à Asclépius*: *DH* I-X (*DH* XI est une interpolation). Tout à fait nouveau quand ce texte est publié pour la première fois en 1956 (sauf un court fragment parallèle au grec de *SH* XIX,1), mais d'autres parallèles grecs ont été trouvés récemment cf. *infra* n° 8
Manandyan (H.), Arevšatyan (S.) 1956, p. 298-314 (texte arménien et trad. russe): editio princeps
Mahé 1982, *HHE* tome 2, p. 356-405 (texte arménien et traduction française)

6. Court extrait arménien dans une collection de *Témoignages des philosophes du dehors sur la divinité*
Parallèle au grec de *Chronicon Paschale*, Cedrenus, Malalas et à un extrait syriaque (§ 4, cf. *infra* n° 7)
Mahé 1982, *HHE* tome 2, p. 344-347: première édition critique

7. *H Syr*: Extraits syriaques dans un *Recueil de prophéties des philosophes païens*
Parallèles, pour la plupart, à des textes grecs déjà connus, cf. Brock (S.) 1984
Brock (S.) 1983 (texte syriaque, trad. anglaise et parallèles grecs; les extraits hermétiques figurent aux §§ 4.14.19.21): editio princeps

8. Six extraits grecs
parallèles à l'arménien de *DH* IV,1-2-V,1. VI,1-3. VII,2-4. VIII,4. VIII,7-IX,3. IX,5 (cf. *supra n°* 5)
Paramelle, Mahé 1991 B: editio princeps (sous presse)

9. Cinq extraits sur l'âme et la procréation de l'homme.
Tout a fait nouveaux
Paramelle (J.), Mahé (J.-P.) 1991 A: editio princeps (sous presse)

Plutôt que de commenter successivement les neuf numéros de cette liste, il me paraît approprié de recourir à une présentation synthétique en les resituant dans les différentes étapes de «la voie d'immortalité»[3] hermétique.

Commençons par citer deux textes célèbres qui définissent le but et le sens de cette voie:

> «Plût au ciel qu'il te fût donné d'avoir des ailes et de t'envoler vers l'air, et là, placé au milieu de la terre et du ciel, de voir la masse solide de la terre, les flots répandus de la mer, les cours fluents des fleuves, les mouvements

libres de l'air, la pénétration du feu, la course des astres, la rapidité du ciel, son circuit autour des mêmes points! Oh! que cette vue est la plus bienheureuse, enfant, quand on contemple en un seul moment toutes ces merveilles, l'immobile mis en mouvement, l'inapparent se rendant apparent au travers des œuvres qu'il crée.» (*CH* V,5)

Mais parvenir à cette voie est difficile:

«Vois-tu, mon enfant, combien il nous faut traverser de corps, combien de chœurs de démons, et quelle succession continue et quels cours des astres, afin de nous hâter vers l'Un-et-Seul?» (*CH* IV,8)

Le désir de remonter à la source de l'Etre, au tout premier moment de la création, de rechercher la présence immédiate de l'Un, le Dieu invisible qui se manifeste dans le Tout, est le principal ressort de l'imagination hermétique, telle que nous pouvions la connaître d'après les grandes collections diffusées en Europe depuis le début de la Renaissance.[4]

Les écrits nouvellement découverts participent du même élan et remontent à la même origine. Bien que certains d'entre eux aient été conservés dans des traductions coptes, syriaques ou arméniennes, tous proviennent d'originaux grecs composés vraisemblablement, comme les autres écrits philosophiques attribués à Hermès, entre le Ier et le IIIème siècle de notre ère.[5] Malgré la diversité des dates et des auteurs, ces écrits présentent une certaine cohérence qu'il convient de chercher non dans l'exposé d'un système, mais dans une méthode de conduite spirituelle, une préparation des âmes à la «voie d'immortalité», dont la connaissance s'acquiert par la tradition des ancêtres, les exercices de méditation et l'initiation aux mystères.

La tradition ne peut être vraiment authentique et ancienne qu'en Egypte. Comme le rapporte Platon dans le *Timée* (22 b), tous les autres peuples sont réduits à une enfance perpétuelle, parce que leur mémoire collective est périodiquement anéantie par des déluges d'eau et de feu. Seul l'Egyptien Hermès Trismégiste, demeurant dans un pays que les crues régulières du Nil protègent de ces catastrophes récurrentes, a pu, d'après Manéthon, retranscrire et déposer dans les temples, à l'usage de son fils Tat, les enseignements antédiluviens de son grand-père Thot le premier Hermès, gravés sur des tables par son père, Agathodémon (NF t.3, p. CLXIII). Ces enseignements auraient été traduits et divulgués en langue grecque par Ptolémée II Philadelphe (308-246), à qui, indépendamment de toute légende, on doit effectivement la traduction du Coutumier démotique, de la Loi juive, entre autres monuments religieux et législatifs importants.[6]

Conversant avec les «anciens dieux» (*SH* XXIII, 32), témoins oculaires de la Création,[7] Thot s'assimile, d'après *FH* 21, au premier homme qui, comme Adam en *Gn.*2, 20, nomme pour la première fois tous les êtres. Il est donc le seul interprète (Hermès/ἑρμηνεύς) authentique des réalités primordiales, ce qui justifie d'avance les emprunts de l'hermétisme non seulement à l'Égypte ancienne, mais encore au judaïsme (notamment à la traduction biblique des Septante) et à la philosophie grecque. Que peuvent dire Platon, dans le *Timée*, ou Moïse, dans la *Genèse*, sur les origines du monde, dont ils aient été réellement témoins? S'ils savent un peu de la vérité, ils ne peuvent l'avoir appris que d'Hermès.[8] Ainsi, ce que nous appelons «emprunt» est, pour l'hermétiste, une restitution des traditions mystiques et philosophiques de l'humanité à leur source véritable.

Comment peut-on retrouver la tradition des ancêtres et entrer dans la voie d'immortalité? Il importe d'abord de connaître les étapes de cette voie et de pratiquer les exercices qui permettent de franchir chacune d'entre elles. Le texte le plus éclairant sur cette question est la *Prière d'action de grâces* du codex VI de Nag Hammadi, qui était déjà précédemment connue en grec par le papyrus Mimaut du Louvre (Paris n° 2391), où elle figurait dans une compilation magique, et par la conclusion de l'*Asclepius* latin, adaptation assez libre du *Discours Parfait*, une somme hermétique du IIIe siècle. La confrontation de ces trois témoins montre que le copte remonte à un modèle grec supérieur à celui du papyrus Mimaut et offre en général un texte, beaucoup plus sûr.[9]

«Voici la prière qu'ils ont dite.
Nous te rendons grâces, nous tous qui avons une âme,
et notre coeur est tendu vers toi, ô Nom qu'on ne trouble pas,
honoré de l'appellation de Dieu et béni de l'appellation de Père;
car vers chacun et vers le Tout s'étend la bienveillance du Père, son affection, sa faveur
et, en fait d'évidence,[10] tout ce qu'il y a de doux, de simple,
nous apportant en grâce l'intellect, le discours et la gnose:
l'intellect, pour que nous te comprenions,
le discours, pour que nous nous fassions tes interprètes,[11]
la gnose, pour que nous te connaissions.
Nous nous réjouissons d'avoir été illuminés par ta gnose.
Nous nous réjouissons parce que tu nous as renseignéd sur toi.
Nous nous réjouissons parce que, dans ce corps, tu as fait de nous des dieux dans ta gnose".

(*NH* VI, 63,33-64,19)

Ainsi l'homme rend grâces à Dieu de lui avoir donné trois facultés permettant de s'élever vers lui: l'intellect, le discours et la gnose. On peut se demander si ces facultés concourent toutes les trois simultanément à guider l'homme sur la voie d'immortalité ou si elles s'acquièrent plutôt successivement, constituant en elles-mêmes les étapes de la voie.

La réponse nous est fournie par *CH* IX,10:

> «Le discours ne s'avance pas jusqu'à la vérité. Mais l'intellect, lui, est puissant, et, après qu'il a été guidé jusqu'à un point de la route par le discours, il peut s'avancer jusqu'à la vérité. Alors, ayant embrassé d'une même vue tous les êtres, comme il a découvert que tout est d'accord avec ce qui a été interprété par le discours, il a cru, et il a trouvé son repos dans cette belle croyance».

Dans ce texte, il est clair que l'intellect vient après le discours; mais comme ce dernier occupe une position médiane, la gnose est nécessairement avant lui. Ainsi, les trois étapes de la voie hermétique sont citées, dans la *Prière d'action de grâces*, en ordre descendant: l'intellect, le discours et la gnose.

Que la gnose, appelée en *CH* X,9 «achèvement de la science (ἐπιστήμη)»,[11a] nous apparaisse ici comme la première étape de la voie serait sans doute une sorte de paradoxe si on la concevait comme un savoir constitué, d'un contenu défini, qui pourrait faire l'objet d'un enseignement en règle, more geometrico, par axiomes, théorèmes et démonstrations. Mais en réalité la gnose hermétique est un éveil spirituel, une prise de conscience (*CH* IX, 4), le contraire de l'ignorance de Dieu (ἀγνωσία τοῦ θεοῦ: *CH* I,27. XIV,8; cf. *CH* VII,1. X,8), qui nous fait passer de l'indifférence ignorante concernant Dieu et l'âme à la certitude que Dieu existe et veut être connu (*CH* I,31).

Par conséquent, d'après *CH* IV,9:

> «La connaissance ne marque pas le commencement du Bien lui-même, c'est seulement pour nous qu'elle le fait commencer en tant qu'objet à connaître. Saisissons-nous donc de ce commencement et parcourons tout en hâte: car c'est une voie tortueuse que d'abandonner les objets familiers et présents pour rebrousser chemin vers les choses anciennes et primordiales».

En tant que première étape de la voie hermétique, la gnose est inséparable de la piété, c'est-à-dire d'un certain genre de vie entièrement consacré à la dévotion (cf. *CH* I,27. VI,5. IX,4), ainsi que le souligne la conclusion de notre *Prière d'action de grâces* (*NH* VI,64,31-65,2):

> «Nous te demandons d'accéder à un seul désir:
> nous voulons être préservés dans la gnose;

et l'unique sauvegarde est ce que nous voulons: ne pas déchoir de ce genre de vie!»[12]

Mais, dans la vie courante, comment cette μετὰ γνώσεως εὐσέβεια (*CH* VI,5), c'est-à-dire cette piété tout intérieure illuminée par la gnose du Dieu suprême, peut-elle s'accommoder de la piété courante et en quelque sorte institutionnelle, avec ses innombrables cultes polythéistes et l'activité quotidienne des temples et des sanctuaires? Loin de rejeter cette dévotion populaire, Hermès la valorise et la justifie, tout en cherchant à la compléter, à l'approfondir et à la spiritualiser.

Cela ressort clairement de l'un des nouveaux textes hermétiques coptes, le *Fragment du Discours Parfait*[13] conservé dans le codex VI de Nag Hammadi. A en juger d'après les quelques fragments grecs qui nous sont parvenus grâce à des citations d'auteurs anciens, cette version copte est d'une remarquable exactitude, qui contraste avec le laxisme de l'adaptation latine du même texte grec en *Asclepius* 21-29.[14] Non seulement le latin présente, par rapport au copte, toutes sortes d'écarts rédactionnels plus ou moins importants,[15] mais surtout il omet une saisissante description des enfers (*NH* VI, 77-78), que le copte est seul à nous avoir conservée.[16]

Rappelons le contenu général du texte.[17] En présence de Tat et d'Ammon, Hermès s'entretient avec Asclépius de la religion et de la piété. C'est en lui-même que l'homme doit rechercher l'image de Dieu. Il peut en avoir une première intuition en contemplant le mystère de la procréation, où le couple humain ressemble au Créateur,[18] qui est, littéralement, le père et la mère de tous les êtres. On pourrait rapprocher de cette idée un autre passage de la *Prière d'action de grâces* du même codex VI, où Dieu est à la fois matrice et phallus engendrant les créatures (*NH* VI,64,25-30):

«O matrice de toute génération,[19] nous t'avons connue,
ô matrice qui conçois par le phallus du Père, nous t'avons connue,
ô permanence éternelle du Père géniteur, c'est ainsi que nous avons vénéré ta bonté»

C'est évidemment une très ancienne représentation mythologique empruntée à l'Egypte qui s'exprime ici. La prière hermétique pourrait être comparée à la cosmogonie memphite du papyrus démotique de Berlin n° 13603:

«C'est lui le père des dieux et c'est aussi la mère... et son surnom c'est 'La Femme'. C'est lui la matrice où se déverse la semence de tout ce qui est

sorti du Noun. C'est le grand Hâpy, père des dieux,... dont une moitié est d'homme et l'autre de femme».[20]

Mais, au-delà de cette image, l'homme découvre la bonté divine dans les facultés supérieures qui lui ont été accordées, notamment «la science et la gnose» (ἐπιστήμη et γνῶσις: *NH* VI, 67,23-24), qui le rendent supérieur aux «dieux», c'est-à-dire aux étoiles et aux autres corps astraux. Grâce à la science et à la gnose, l'homme peut établir des rapports authentiques avec le divin. De même que le Père, Seigneur du Tout, crée les dieux-astres dans le ciel, ainsi l'homme fabrique des dieux sur la terre; et ces derniers ne sont pas des statues inertes, mais des êtres dotés d'âme et de souffle.

Là-dessus, Hermès entreprend de justifier les cultes égyptiens traditionnels, en expliquant qu'ils sont nécessaires à l'équilibre de l'univers. En effet, comme l'Egypte est «l'image du ciel», «la demeure...de toutes les puissances qui sont dans le ciel» et « le temple du monde» (*NH* VI, 70,4-10), si les étrangers qui dominent le pays empêchent les Egyptiens d'honorer leurs dieux, les hommes tomberont dans l'impiété, pécheront envers le monde et envers l'âme et, finalement, le Démiurge n'aura d'autre ressource que de répondre aux désordres humains par un désordre cosmique. Il détruira le monde, le ramenant à ses éléments primitifs, de façon à le recréer de neuf avec une humanité épurée.

Ainsi l'exige la volonté de Dieu, qui souhaite que le monde soit toujours excellent et dispense tous les biens à travers une multiplicité d'entités démoniques ou divines, réparties depuis le sommet du cosmos jusqu'aux plus basses régions de la terre, chacune dans son domaine et dans la sphère d'activité qui lui est propre. C'est ainsi que les anciens dieux, présentement exilés dans le désert de Libye ou dans l'arrière-pays, finiront par reprendre leur place à Alexandrie, la cité construite à la tête de l'Egypte, où affluent toutes les races humaines, par terre et par mer (*NH* VI, 75,26-76,1).

Mais, indépendamment de leurs conséquences sociales et cosmiques, la piété et l'impiété sont aussi déterminantes pour le sort de chaque individu après la mort. En effet, si le corps, ramené au moment de la mort à ses éléments primitifs, se dissout et demeure incapable de souffrir, il en va tout autrement pour l'âme qui est soumise au jugement d'un «grand démon» (*NH* VI, 76,22-23) et doit alors répondre de tous ses actes: si elle a œuvré avec piété, elle pourra séjourner «dans la région qui lui sied» (*Ascl.* 28), mais si elle a mal agi, elle est projetée dans un

enfer aérien situé dans la mer des nuages, où elle est tourmentée par des démons vengeurs, qui la font passer alternativement du chaud au froid en la plongeant tantôt dans le feu des éclairs et tantôt dans les réservoirs de neige qui sont au-dessus du ciel visible. Si terribles que soient ces châtiments, ils ne remettent pas néanmoins en cause la bonté du Dieu suprême, qui n'est pas responsable de ces maux, ni des débordements à la suite desquels les âmes s'y trouvent entraînées (*NH* VI, 77-78).

Malgré son caractère fragmentaire, cet extrait du *Discours Parfait* constitue un véritable traité *De cultu deorum*, c'est-à-dire à la fois une apologie de la piété et de la morale traditionnelles et une invitation à les compléter ou à les dépasser par une compréhension plus profonde et plus spirituelle.

D'un côté, en effet, la religion égyptienne est valorisée en ce qu'elle a de plus local et de plus spécifique. L'Egypte n'est pas un lieu indifférent. Elle est «un pays pieux au-dessus de tous les pays» (*NH* VI, 70,31-32), «la demeure des dieux», «l'école de la piété» (*NH* VI, 71,33); ses pierres gravées sont des «paroles qui font merveille» (*NH* VI, 71,4), etc. On perçoit, dans ces éloges, la même vénération que, dans les extraits hermétiques de Stobée, Isis inculque à son jeune fils Horus pour «le très saint pays de nos ancêtres», cœur et milieu du monde (*SH* XXIV, 13), avec ses stèles et ses obélisques (*SH* XXIII, 66), ses tortues et ses crocodiles «bien de chez nous» (*SH* XXV,6).

Mais, plus que cette fierté naïve et tous ces détails pittoresques, ce qui est en jeu ici, c'est la mémoire et la tradition du passé. La terre d'Egypte et le Nil, l'un et l'autre invoqués et cités comme témoins dans le corps du discours (*NH* VI, 70,36-37 - 71,17), garantissent en quelque sorte l'authenticité, la valeur primordiale de cultes remontant aux origines du monde et prouvant encore chaque jour leur efficacité. Reprenant à son compte une opinion courante en Egypte à toutes les époques, Hermès considère comme une évidence indiscutable que les statues des temples, réanimées chaque matin selon un rituel bien connu, accomplissent des prédictions, provoquent des maladies, opèrent des guérisons (*NH* VI, 69,33-70,2) et sont même capables de quitter ou de regagner leurs sanctuaires en fonction des comportements humains (*NH* VI, 71,12. 73,4. 75,26-27). Comment se risquerait-on à les mécontenter en interrompant le service qui leur est dû?

Tout comme la piété populaire, la morale courante mérite le respect. L'homme a le devoir d'admirer et d'embellir l'univers, de prendre soin de son âme, d'aimer la vie et la lumière, d'être sage, vaillant et bienfai-

sant (*NH* VI, 71,36-72,34), s'abstenir du mal, spécialement guerres et brigandages (*NH* VI, 73,10-11), meurtres et pillages de temples (*NH* VI, 78,16-17.29). Seuls les impies et les incrédules peuvent s'obstiner à croire (*NH* VI, 77,28-32) que ces crimes, qui offensent les dieux et les hommes (*NH* VI, 70,20), demeureront toujours impunis, pourvu qu'ils soient cachés! Ils s'imaginent que seule la loi humaine peut les châtier (*NH* VI, 77,37-78,1). Mais ils ignorent la différence d'ici-bas et de l'au-delà (*NH* VI, 78,6-7) et de quelle redoutable perspicacité fera preuve le juge des enfers (*NH* VI, 77,3-10).

Quant aux bourreaux de l'autre monde, ils auront, sur leurs confrères d'ici-bas, l'avantage que leur victime est immortelle. Soumise aux plus cruels supplices, l'âme ne saurait s'anéantir, car alors ce serait délivrance et non point châtiment (*NH* VI, 77,24-27). Gare à ceux qui refuseront aujourd'hui de croire à ces paroles, car demain ils en subiront la réalité (*NH* VI, 77,30-37)!

Quoique, pour certains traits essentiels, la description hermétique du jugement *post mortem* s'inspire d'une sorte de vulgate synthétique des grands mythes platoniciens de l'au-delà (*Gorgias*, *Phédon*, *République*),[21] on y trouve aussi des détails plus ou moins pittoresques sur le voyage céleste et les châtiments éventuels de l'âme, qui sont également attestés dans des apocryphes, comme les *Apocalypses d'Hénoch*, *de Paul* ou *de Pierre*.[22] L'influence égyptienne est patente dans ce dernier texte et, de toute façon, la croyance au jugement des morts demeure solidement ancrée en Egypte à toutes les époques.

Cependant, l'approbation motivée de la religion, de la morale et des croyances traditionnelles n'empêche pas l'auteur hermétique de plaider pour l'approfondissement et la spiritualisation de cette piété populaire. Si puissants, en effet, et si respectables, que soient les innombrables dieux qu'on vénère dans les temples d'Egypte, ils ne représentent à eux tous qu'une petite partie, un aspect déjà dérivé du divin. Comme le montrent leurs statues fabriquées par les hommes, ces dieux ont non seulement des têtes, mais encore tous les autres membres du corps (*NH* VI, 69,19-22). Ils sont donc sujets aux passions, et notamment à la colère, tout comme les hommes (*Ascl.*37).

En cela, ils diffèrent absolument des dieux-astres, créés dans une matière céleste incorruptible (*NH* VI, 69,13) et assujettis à la nécessité rationnelle de leurs immuables trajectoires (*NH* VI, 67,16-21).

Ces dieux-là ont uniquement des têtes (*NH* VI, 69,14), puisque le monde lui-même est une sphère, c'est-à-dire une tête, et que tout objet

attaché à la membrane de cette tête, c'est-à-dire à la voûte céleste, est immortel et animé d'un mouvement circulaire (*CH* X,11).

Plus proches des hommes dans l'espace, les âmes des dieux-statues en sont aussi plus proches dans le temps que les dieux-astres, car elles sont apparues (*SH* XXIII,8), après la création de l'humanité (*SH* XXIII, 44), à une époque beaucoup plus récente (*SH* XXIII, 64) que les mystères du ciel, présents dès le début de la création (*SH* XXIII,2).

Entre ces dieux terrestres et les dieux-astres, s'étage toute une hiérarchie d'autres dieux au-dessus du ciel visible, comme Pantomorphe, le dieu du zodiaque et les Ousiarques, gardiens des sept sphères planétaires (*Ascl.* 19; cf. *CH* I, 9. *NH* VI, 63,19), ou en dessous, comme le Démiurge qui domine entre ciel et terre, Zeus-Ploutonios, Seigneur de la terre et de la mer, Corè qui porte les moissons, etc. (*NH* VI, 75,13-22).

Au sommet de cette hiérarchie divine, dans un lieu bien supérieur au ciel[23] (*CH* IV, 5. *SH* XXI,2), extérieur au monde (*CH* XI,19), où il n'y a pas d'étoiles et qui est fort éloigné des corps (*NH* VI,75,8-13), siège le Dieu suprême, celui précisément que l'on cherche à atteindre dans les traités initiatiques et à qui les disciples illuminés adressent leurs plus ferventes prières, comme celle du codex VI, véritable «sacrifice de discours» (λογικὴ θυσία), qui dispense des victimes et des aromates, que le peuple réserve, à juste titre, aux divinités inférieures.

Mais pour connaître ce Dieu suprême et savoir l'honorer dignement, les croyances et les cultes traditionnels ne sont pas suffisants. Il faut prendre une certaine distance par rapport à la foule — ce qui n'est pas toujours sans péril (*CH* IX, 4)—et rejoindre les disciples d'Hermès pour recevoir l'enseignement du discours. A vrai dire, nous sommes assez mal informés sur le cursus des études hermétiques, pour la raison très simple qu'un grand nombre de textes ont été perdus et que tous les recueils actuellement publiés dans les éditions classiques de Scott-Ferguson ou Nock-Festugière sont des florilèges constitués deux à neuf siècles après la composition des traités. Par conséquent, nous n'avons que des renseignements très fragmentaires sur l'organisation des collections et des recueils les plus anciens.

En 1951, Heinrich Oellacher a publié[24] des fragments de papyri grecs copiés dans le Fayyum, probablement dans la région d'Arsinoïte ou d'Héracléopolis, à la fin du IIe ou au début du IIIe siècle de notre ère.[25] Indépendamment de leur contenu — de brefs fragments de dialogues,

numérotés 9 et 10, entre Hermès et Tat, portant sur des questions théologiques — ces textes nous transmettent au moins deux données importantes pour l'histoire du développement de la littérature hermétique. Tout d'abord, le seul fait que ces dialogues portent des numéros montre que les enseignements d'Hermès étaient déjà assez nombreux à la fin du IIe siècle pour qu'on pût en former des collections. En effet, outre la collection à laquelle appartiennent nos fragments et qui comptait au moins dix unités, il y avait encore une collection plus ancienne, à laquelle se réfèrent nos fragments: celle des Γενικοὶ Λόγοι, c'est-à-dire des *Leçons générales*.

D'autres textes hermétiques antérieurement connus mentionnent ces mêmes *Leçons* ou les citent explicitement (*CH* X,1. 7. XIII,1. *SH* III,1. VI,1). On pourrait d'ailleurs supposer que *SH* VI, qui a toutes les apparences d'un traité complet sur les trente-six décans, constitue l'une de ces *Leçons*, puisque, dans les premiers mots du texte, Tat dit à Hermès «dans tes précédentes *Leçons générales*», comme s'il se référait au contexte immédiat. Néanmoins, même si cette identification était tout à fait assurée, elle ne nous apprendrait rien sur la structure d'ensemble du recueil[26] en tant que tel, encore moins sur le rôle qu'il jouait dans le cursus des études hermétiques.

C'est ici que les *Hermetica* coptes viennent encore à notre secours. A la fin du traité initiatique du codex VI, sur *L'Ogdoade et l'Ennéade*, Hermès interdit au profane de lire ce livre saint tant qu'il n'aura pas été engendré par Dieu. En attendant il devra se contenter des *Leçons générales* et des ἐξοδιαχοί (*NH* VI, 63,1-3). Ce dernier terme, qui n'est pas connu des lexicographes, doit vraisemblablement être corrigé en διεξοδικοί d'après *FH* 30.33.[27] Aux *Leçons générales* succéderaient ainsi, comme il semble logique, des *Leçons détaillées*.[28] Nous avons là une précieuse indication sur la progression des traités.

L'enseignement contenu dans ces recueils était mémorisé à l'aide de définitions (ὅροι) ou de brèves sentences (κεφάλαια) faisant office de résumés (περιοχαί). Ces résumés pouvaient être d'ailleurs redéveloppés par le disciple, à titre d'exercice, comme nous l'apprenons par *SH* XI,3.[29] Il semble en fait que ces collections de sentences juxtaposées, enchaînées par des conjonctions, commentées, insérées dans des mythes ou dans des prières, soient à l'origine de tous nos *Hermetica* actuels, à l'exception des *SH* XXIII-XXVI.[30]

Les principales collections de sentences hermétiques actuellement connues sont les *Dits du Bon Démon*, fragmentairement cités en *CH*

XII,1. 8. 9. 13, à quoi s'ajoutent *SH* XI surtout les *Définitions d'Hermès Trismégiste à Asclépius*, conservées dans une traduction arménienne du VIe siècle, publiée pour la première fois par H. Manandyan en 1956, avec une traduction russe de S. Arevšatyan.[31] J'en ai donné, en 1976, une première traduction[32] française qui permit au Professeur Gilles Quispel[33] de constater que la sentence arménienne *DH* IX,4 («Qui se connaît lui-même connaît le Tout») apparaissait sous une forme dérivée dans le célèbre *Poimandrès* (*CH* I,18): «*Que celui qui a l'intellect se reconnaisse soi-même* comme immortel, et qu'il sache que la cause de la mort est l'amour, *et qu'il connaisse tous les êtres*». Cette observation, qu'on pourrait confirmer par d'autres rapprochements (par exemple, entre *CH* I,6 et *DH* I,4, *CH* I,17 et *DH* IX,2), est d'une importance capitale: elle démontre que certaines au moins des définitions hermétiques existaient avant le *Poimandrès*, c'est-à-dire à la fin du Ier siècle.[34] Du même coup, l'hypothèse que les sentences hermétiques pourraient être à l'origine des traités reçoit une consistance chronologique[35] et elle est, d'autre part, largement attestée par l'abondance des parallèles qu'on peut établir entre les *Définitions* arméniennes et les autres textes hermétiques.[36]

La remarque du Professeur Quispel m'encouragea à publier, en 1982, un nouveau texte critique arménien et une traduction française révisée des *Définitions* hermétiques.[37] Eliminant, à la fin du texte, une longue interpolation tirée du chapitre V de Némésius d'Emèse,[38] j'avais noté, dans cette édition, juste avant l'interpolation, un parallèle tout à fait littéral, mais assez bref, entre *DH* X,7 et *SH* XXIX,1.[39] Depuis ma publication, le Révérend Père J. Paramelle a isolé, dans une compilation hermétique constituée de textes bien connus, d'ailleurs fortement abrégés,[40] de longs fragments grecs des *Définitions* hermétiques[41] qui recoupent plusieurs paragraphes de l'arménien: précisément, d'après mon édition de 1982, *DH* IV,1-2-V,1. VI,1-3. VII,2-4. VIII,3.7. IX,1-3.5.

Bien que la tradition de ce nouveau texte grec des *DH* soit particulièrement haplographique et défectueuse,[42] sa comparaison avec l'arménien est extrêmement instructive. On peut reconstruire des sentences connues jusqu'à présent sous une forme altérée ou écourtée. Par exemple, en *DH* VII,4, on peut lire cet enseignement sur les trois composantes de la personne humaine, le corps, l'âme et l'intellect: «L'âme entre dans le corps par nécessité, mais l'intellect entre dans l'âme par jugement». *Par jugement* (κατὰ κρίσιν) est un apport du grec, qui s'accorde magnifiquement avec *CH* X,16, où nous lisons qu'après la mort «l'intel-

lect se purifie de ses enveloppes... ayant abandonné l'âme au jugement (κρίσει) et au verdict qu'elle mérite». Au lieu de *jugement*, l'arménien lisait *nature*, peut-être par confusion entre *kʿnnutʿiwn* et *bnutʿiwn*.

En *DH* IX,1, nous lisons cet enseignement sur la connaissance de Dieu:

> «Tout homme a la pensée de Dieu, car s'il est homme, il connaît aussi Dieu. Tout homme n'est homme que par le fait d'avoir la pensée de Dieu; aussi bien tout homme n'en a pas la pensée. L'homme et les dieux et toutes choses existent par Dieu et pour l'homme. Dieu est toutes choses et rien, pas même ce qui n'est pas, n'est extérieur à Dieu: car Dieu n'est rien, ni même une seule chose. L'homme est issu de l'homme et les dieux sont à cause de Dieu. L'homme est pour Dieu et toutes choses sont pour l'homme: Dieu domine l'homme et l'homme domine le Tout».

Par rapport au texte critique arménien publié en 1982, le grec vient de nous permettre une meilleure interprétation du passage, et notamment de la phrase difficile sur Dieu et le néant.[43] D'autre part, il oblige à rétablir plusieurs membres de phrases absents de l'arménien, par exemple: «aussi bien tout homme n'en a pas la pensée» et «l'homme est issu de l'homme et les dieux sont à cause de Dieu».

Après ces sentences grecques parallèles aux *Définitions* arméniennes, figurent, dans le même manuscrit, d'autres développements hermétiques tout à fait inédits.[44] A mon avis, il s'agit de cinq[45] fragments extraits d'un même traité hermétique sur l'âme, qui présente de grandes affinités avec *SH* VIII et *SH* XV-XX, spécialement XV-XVII, adressés à Ammon.[46]

— l'extrait n° 1 traite de la substance de l'âme.
— l'extrait n° 2 concerne les sens et compare la vue au feu, l'ouïe à l'air, l'odorat à l'eau et le goût à la terre.
— l'extrait n° 3 oppose la loi humaine, fondée sur l'opinion, à la loi divine qui est dans le ciel.
— l'extrait n° 4 explique comment la partie intellective et raisonnable de l'âme parvient à gouverner la partie irraisonnable, constituée de l'irascible et du concupiscible, à l'aide d'une faculté spéciale, appelée λογισμός.
— l'extrait n° 5 concerne le développement et l'animation de l'embryon.

A l'exception de l'extrait n° 3, il s'agit donc de sujets médicaux. Mais il faut remarquer que même le développement sur la loi, inclus dans l'extrait n°3, n'est probablement pas étranger au contexte. En effet, ce

développement rattache la loi humaine aux mauvais penchants de l'âme, qui devraient être domptés par la raison.

A titre d'exemple, je voudrais citer ici la traduction de l'extrait n° 1:

> «**I,1** C'est pourquoi l'âme, étant incorporelle, sans figure, indivise et à l'opposé des accidents du corps — figure et couleur — ainsi que l'altérité même qui est propre aux corps ⟨...⟩, elle demeure toujours dans le même état, sans changement; par une seule chose, elle maintient son immortalité: elle-même, puisqu'elle s'appartient toujours à elle même, **2** elle qui n'a besoin de rien d'autre pour se sauver et qui ne participe ni au mouvement ni à la naissance. **3** Or un tel être n'a pas de naissance, ce qui n'est pas né ne s'accroît pas, ce qui ne s'accroît pas ne diminue pas, ce qui ne diminue pas ne se corrompt pas, ce qui ne se corrompt pas est immuable, ce qui n'est pas soumis à mutation est stable, ce qui est stable ne peut être mis en mouvement par le flux du changement corporel, ce qui ne peut être mis en mouvement se meut de soi-même par sa propre nature et ce qui se meut de soi-même est immortel et intellectif à cause de l'intellect: voilà ce que serait le pouvoir de l'essence intelligible».

Je mentionnerai rapidement les fragments hermétiques assez brefs et d'un intérêt plus limité, qui ont été publiés en 1983 et 1984, d'après des recueils syriaques de prophéties des philosophes païens.[47] Parallèles aux chroniqueurs byzantins ou à la *Théosophie* de Tübingen,[48] la plupart de ces extraits figuraient déjà, sous une forme ou sous une autre, soit chez Scott-Ferguson,[49] soit chez Nock-Festugière.[50] Qu'il nous suffise d'en citer un pour caractériser l'esprit de tous les autres. A propos de la personnalité d'Hermès Trismégiste, le compilateur syriaque écrit:

> «This man was from Egypt, outstanding in wisdom; he interpreted and said that the name of the ineffable one and the maker consists of threefold powers of majesty, but the godhead he said, is one. For this reason he was called by the Egyptians 'Trismegistos', i.e. of three-fold greatness».[51]

Ce texte est attesté en grec chez Malalas,[52] Cédrénus[53] et dans le *Chronicon Paschale*;[54] il figure aussi en arménien dans une série de *Témoignages des philosophes du dehors sur la divinité*.[55]

Les autres fragments syriaques traitent également des hypostases divines.[56] Ces spéculations sur Dieu, Un et Trine, résultent probablement d'une exégèse de la doctrine que nous allons exposer dans un instant, selon laquelle le Dieu unique contient en lui les trois puissances de l'Inengendré, l'Autogène et l'Engendré.[57]

Ce bref aperçu des *Définitions* et autres écrits ou fragments hermétiques récemment découverts, ne rend compte que très incomplètement de ce que pouvait être le cursus d'enseignement dans son ensemble. Rappe-

lons seulement que le but de cet enseignement était de développer le discours, c'est-à-dire la faculté qui préside à la deuxième étape de la voie hermétique.

Cependant, même si le discours parvient à accomplir la tâche qu'il se donne, en *SH* XI,1, de parcourir d'un bout à l'autre[58] (διεξελθεῖν) la série des êtres — ce qui est proprement le but des διεξοδικοὶ λόγοι — il ne parviendra jamais à dire ou même à nommer Dieu d'une façon adéquate.[59] En effet, comme nous l'apprend le fragment hermétique de Vienne, que j'ai publié dans le *Mémorial Festugière*, en corrigeant sur ce point la lecture défectueuse de H. Oellacher: «Le Dieu unique n'a pas besoin de nom; Un, en effet, Celui-qui-est est anonyme».[60] Comment en serait-il autrement, puisque le nom et les autres parties du discours sont des unités limitées qui se succèdent dans le temps?[61]

Pour atteindre Dieu le discours est insuffisant; il faut une autre faculté plus puissante et plus intuitive, l'intellect, qui saisit tout d'un seul regard (*CH* IX,10). Or, c'est un dogme hermétique bien connu qu'à la différence du discours, l'intellect n'est pas donné à tous les hommes, mais seulement à ceux qui prennent la peine de le gagner (*CH* IV,3).

Ce résultat peut être atteint à l'aide d'exercices appropriés,[62] dont je me contenterai de signaler certains d'une façon extrêmement schématique, surtout d'après les *DH*. Avant de pouvoir contempler Dieu lui-même, l'intellect doit apprendre à contempler ses images,[63] c'est-à-dire le monde et l'homme. C'est ainsi que commencent les *DH* (I,1):

> «Dieu: monde intelligible; monde: Dieu sensible; homme: monde destructible ...ainsi donc il y a trois mondes. Or le monde immobile c'est Dieu, tandis que le monde raisonnable c'est l'homme: car ces deux unités ne font qu'un, Dieu et l'homme à son image».

Nous avons vu, en commentant le fragment du *DP*, *NH* VI 65,15 s., que l'union de l'homme et de la femme peut être matière à contempler l'image du Dieu créateur. D'autres exercices de contemplation spirituelle sont proposés ailleurs dans le *CH*, par exemple en *CH* V,3-7, où l'on contemple d'abord le monde, puis le corps humain créé par Dieu; *CH* XI,13, où l'on contemple l'homme en train de procréer; *CH* XII,21, où l'on considère de nouveau le monde et *CH* XIV,9-10, où l'on décrit un laboureur en train de semer.[64]

Bien entendu, il ne s'agit pas d'une vision concrète, attachée aux détails et aux apparences matérielles, mais d'une vision intériorisée,[65] où

l'imagination s'efforce de saisir l'invisible au-delà du visible. Cela est d'autant plus facile quand l'objet de contemplation fait appel à l'expérience intime du sujet.[66] Mais n'y aurait-il pas moyen d'aller encore plus loin, en abolissant la limite que la conscience place toujours entre le moi et l'autre, l'intérieur et l'extérieur,[67] le présent, le passé et l'avenir, son être limité et l'immensité de l'univers? Celui-qui parviendrait à une telle contemplation verrait de la vue même de Dieu.

L'hermétisme a élaboré une méthode qui permet d'obtenir ce résultat. Cela s'appelle «devenir Αἰών», c'est-à-dire, à ce niveau, Dieu cosmique, monde et temps infini.[68] Cette méthode repose sur le principe de sympathie du semblable pour le semblable. Les trois mondes que sont Dieu, le cosmos et l'homme ne sont pas repliés sur eux-mêmes, mais, pour ainsi dire, emboîtés les uns dans les autres, comme nous le lisons en *DH* VII,7: «Dieu est en lui-même, le monde est en Dieu, l'homme est dans le monde». Par conséquent, leurs différentes parties se correspondent entre elles; elles influent par sympathie les unes sur les autres.

Ainsi l'âme comporte une partie irraisonnable dont la substance s'apparente aux passions planétaires. C'est pourquoi, d'après *DH* X,7 (= *SH* XIX,1), «elle attire à elle les pensées de l'harmonie» cosmique. Se pourrait-il que, par sa partie purement rationnelle ou par l'intellect qui est en elle, l'âme soit également capable d'attirer à elle une énergie divine qui la rendrait apte à voir Dieu? C'est bien ce qui semble arriver en *CH* XIII,7, où Hermès commande à son disciple: «Attire cela à toi, et cela viendra; veuille-le, et cela se produit; arrête l'activité des sens du corps, et alors se produira la naissance de la divinité».

Pour se préparer à cette expérience, il faut s'habituer à sentir l'ubiquité de l'intellect dans l'espace et dans le temps. On lit en *DH* IX,7: «Les dieux ont le ciel, les hommes la terre et la mer; mais l'air est en commun aux dieux et aux hommes». De fait, l'homme peut, comme en *CH* XI,19, ordonner à son esprit, aussi bien de descendre au fond des mers que de monter au plus haut du ciel: il s'y rendra, même sans ailes, et rien ne l'en empêchera, ni le feu du soleil, ni l'éther, ni les corps des planètes, ni le tourbillon du cosmos.

Mais ce qui est vrai de l'espace vaut aussi pour le temps. *DH* VI,2 enseigne:

> «De même que tu es sorti du ventre, de même aussi tu sortiras du corps... de même qu'étant sorti du ventre tu ne te souviens plus en rien des choses du ventre, de même aussi étant sorti du corps tu ne te souviendras plus en rien de ce qui est à lui».

Néanmoins, ces ruptures sont le lot de l'humanité ordinaire; car, pour les spirituels, l'intellect est capable grâce à son pouvoir imaginatif, de transcender cette discontinuité, comme en *CH* XI,20:

> «Rassemble en toi-même les sensations de tout le créé, du feu et de l'eau, du sec et de l'humide, imaginant que tu es à la fois partout, sur la terre, dans la mer, au ciel, que tu n'es pas né encore, que tu es dans le ventre maternel, que tu es adolescent, vieillard, que tu es mort, que tu es par delà la mort. Si tu embrasses par la pensée toutes ces choses à la fois, temps, lieux, substances, qualités, quantités, tu peux comprendre Dieu».

On peut s'entraîner par des exercices à imaginer ou à anticiper l'état décrit dans ce passage,[69] mais on n'y parvient véritablement que par l'initiation, c'est-à-dire le mystère de régénération décrit dans *L'Ogdoade et l'Ennéade* du codex VI de Nag Hammadi.

Je ne saurais présenter ici, dans son ensemble, cette œuvre, dont j'ai donné une édition et une traduction commentées.[70] Le titre du traité se réfère aux sphères célestes: l'Ogdoade est au-dessus des sept planètes et l'Ennéade à un niveau encore supérieur.[71] Mais remonter dans l'espace, c'est aussi remonter dans le temps: en accédant à l'Ogdoade, on franchit les huit générations qui séparent Seth de Noé, c'est-à-dire l'humanité actuelle du premier homme engendré.[72] En s'élevant à l'Ennéade, on atteint le niveau d'Adam, l'homme autogénéré. Il ne reste plus qu'un seul niveau pour arriver à la Décade, c'est-à-dire le Dieu Inengendré, l'Eternel, l'Eon des Eons (*NH* VI,59,6-7), qui est à la fois un et dix, comme on peut le comprendre en déchiffrant correctement le mot Αἰών, où α représente le chiffre 1 en grec, ι le chiffre 10, tandis que les deux dernières lettres ών signifient l'être, «Celui-qui-est».[73]

Comment l'initiation permet-elle d'effectuer ce parcours? En provoquant une expérience essentielle, qui s'appelle la vision de soi-même.[74] A deux reprises, en *NH* VI, 58,1. 61,1, Hermès et son disciple déclarent: «Je me vois moi-même». De même en *CH* XIII,13, le disciple s'écrie: «Père, je vois le Tout et je me vois moi-même dans l'intellect». C'est évidemment un écho de la sentence hermétique de *DH* IX,4, «Qui se connaît soi-même connaît le Tout», et Hermès répond: «C'est là précisément la régénération, mon enfant».

On ne se voit pas soi-même dans l'Intellect exactement comme on s'aperçoit dans un miroir. Bien que la comparaison soit partiellement justifiée, il faut aussi noter plusieurs différences essentielles. La vision intellectuelle de soi qui provoque la régénération consiste «à ne plus former ses représentations sous la figure du corps à trois dimensions» (*CH*

XIII,13). Cela implique donc une sorte de mutation de la conscience. Non seulement il faut s'abstraire du monde matériel, des objets que l'on voit autour de soi, afin de «se rendre étranger au monde» (*CH* XIII,1), mais il faut rejeter l'évidence illusoire que le moi des autres est contenu dans leur corps:

> «Tu me vois, mon enfant, avec les yeux, mais ce que je suis, tu ne peux pas le comprendre en me regardant avec les yeux du corps et par la vue sensible; ce n'est pas avec ces yeux-ci qu'on me voit maintenant, mon enfant» (*CH* XIII,3).

Cela signifie aussi bien qu'on ne se voit plus soi-même dans son corps, qu'on n'est plus un corps pour soi, qu'on ne se sent plus être dans ses membres: c'est comme si l'on était «sorti de soi-même» (*CH* XIII,3.4), non point comme en rêve, mais tout éveillé. Pour cela, il faut «arrêter l'activité des sens corporels» (*CH* XIII,7), attirer ou aspirer (ἐπισπᾶν) vers son moi le plus intime (*ibidem*) toute l'âme et la conscience dispersées à travers la chair.

Une telle vision abolit l'opposition entre «l'homme matériel», composé des quatre éléments, et «l'homme essentiel», qui est d'une seule pièce,[75] à l'image du Dieu Intellect (*CH* I,15). Comme le dit *CH* X,6, «l'âme étant attirée à travers le corps, l'homme est tout entier transformé dans l'essence». On revient ainsi à l'époque où l'homme, n'étant pas incarné, ni affecté par les passions planétaires, demeurait encore dans l'Ogdoade. Quand on lève les yeux, à partir de cette position, vers le niveau supérieur, on parvient à se voir soi-même et l'on se trouve régénéré, parce qu'on reproduit le mouvement par lequel le premier Dieu Inengendré se contemple lui-même dans son Intellect Autogène.[76]

Cela apparaît bien dans le traité *Eugnoste* du codex III de Nag Hammadi, où l'on retrouve la même triade divine, Inengendré, Autogène, Engendré, et où, d'après *NH* III, 72,11 s. 75,4 s., l'Inengendré «regardant de tous côtés se voit lui-même par lui-même comme dans un miroir» et se manifeste «dans sa ressemblance en tant que Αὐτοπάτωρ, c'est-à-dire Αὐτογενέτωρ, d'où procèdent une multitude d'Autogènes qui sont ses vis-à-vis». Cette image ou cette manifestation glorieuse de l'Intellect divin, c'est le Premier Adam de lumière qui réside dans l'Ennéade.[77]

Telle est la divinisation, ou plutôt le retour en Dieu vers lequel Trismégiste prétend conduire ses disciples, et c'est tout l'intérêt de ce traité découvert à Nag Hammadi sur *L'Ogdoade et l'Ennéade*, que de nous

indiquer les rites d'initiation et les dispostions intérieures qui permettent d'y accéder. Je considère que ce dialogue n'est pas, comme on l'a quelquefois écrit, un simple *Lesemysterium*,[78] mais un témoignage sur des cérémonies d'initiation qui avaient vraiment lieu dans des confréries hermétiques. Il suffit de le lire attentivement pour comprendre que le plus important n'est pas ce que disent Hermès et le disciple, mais ce qu'ils font et ce qu'ils vivent en le disant. Le message est donc d'ordre pratique, tout autant qu'intellectuel.

Voici décrites, à l'aide des textes découverts après 1945, les trois étapes de la voie hermétique. Du même coup, j'espère avoir montré l'intérêt de ces documents et ce qu'ils nous apprennent sur la progression spirituelle.

Car je crois qu'il est temps d'en finir avec l'équivoque méthodologique qui a trop souvent présidé à la conduite des études hermétiques du XIXe siècle à nos jours. L'hermétisme n'est pas une théorie, ni un système philosophique, mais une voie, c'est-à-dire une progression. Par conséquent, la plupart des textes hermétiques ont pour but non pas de nous dire ce qui est, mais ce que nous devons faire, c'est-à-dire comment nous devons exercer notre esprit.

Par esprit, il ne faut pas seulement entendre les facultés mentales de raisonnement logique, à quoi nous avons tout naturellement tendance, dans le monde contemporain, à restreindre l'exercice légitime de l'intelligence. Pour l'auteur hermétique, la raison ne se limite pas à ces seules facultés, qui relèvent du discours, elle comprend aussi la gnose et l'intellect, qui n'ont rien à voir, ni l'une ni l'autre, avec la réflexion abstraite. Pour autant que les sources permettent d'en juger, tous deux ont le caractère d'intuitions immédiates. La gnose pourrait se comparer au jugement esthétique ou moral, à l'évidence fulgurante du cœur. L'intellect ressemble au contraire à ce que nous appelons imagination. Il déploie en l'homme un vaste espace intérieur, qu'on peut s'entraîner à saisir d'un seul regard; et voici que cet espace dépasse et englobe celui qui s'offre à nos yeux corporels, limité par l'horizon et par la lenteur de nos déplacements. Dilaté par la méditation, l'espace de l'intellect embrasse la totalité de l'être. Sans cesser d'être intérieur, il devient aussi extérieur et lieu d'une vision paradoxale de soi-même. D'imaginaire et subjectif, il devient objectif et réel, de sorte que si l'on remontrait à l'hermétiste qu'il n'a fait que rêver cet espace, sans en prouver logiquement l'existence, ou que la science qu'il croit en retirer n'est qu'une

science imaginaire, il répliquerait sans doute que l'imagination est science en elle-même ou que, dans sa contemplation rêveuse des «images» de l'Etre,

«Quand sur l'abîme un soleil se repose,
Ouvrages purs d'une éternelle cause,
Le Temps scintille et le Songe est savoir».[79]

NOTES

* Texte original d'une conférence prononcée en anglais à l'occasion du colloque *De hermetische Gnosis in de loop der eeuwen*, organisé du 14 au 16 décembre 1990, sous la direction du Professeur Gilles Quispel, par la *Bibliotheca Philosophica Hermetica* d'Amsterdam. Je remercie vivement les organisateurs, Monsieur J. R. Ritman et le Professeur G. Quispel, d'avoir autorisé cette publication sous forme d'article dans *Vigiliae Christianae*.

[1] Sur les éditions antérieures, cf. Van Lamoen 1990, p. 16-91. Sauf indication contraire, les traductions des divers écrits *CH*, *SH* et *FH* sont celles d'A.-J. Festugière, à de menues modifications près.

[2] Nous n'avons pas inclus dans cette liste le fragment repéré par H.-Ch. Puech (1946/1978, t.1, p. 117), car il est dûment signalé et commenté dans le postscriptum d'A.D. Nock (*NF*, t.4, p. 148-149). D'après Wessely (v,3, p. 133), on pourrait trouver d'autres vestiges liés à l'hermétisme dans le *Pap. Vind. gr.* 2082, que nous n'avons pas encore vu. Sur les témoignages de Cicéron, Varron et Martial sur l'Hermès égyptien, cf. Moreschini (C.) 1985, p. 51.

Pour la bibliographie de l'hermétisme, cf. Mahé 1974 (p. 123 n. 2), *HHE* t. 2, Gonzalez-Blanco (A.) 1984, Fowden (G.) 1986 et Büchli (J.) 1987. A quoi l'on ajoutera les références suivantes: Bertolini (M.) 1985, Bonardel (F.) 1985, Camplani (A.) 1986, De Santis (C.) 1987, Di Carlo (F.) 1981, Filorano (G.) 1982, Hornik (H.) 1975, Russell i Mayo (A.) 1984, Segal (R.A.) 1987, Theron (D.J.) 1981, Van Esbroeck (M.) 1986, Whitehouse (D.J.) 1986, Wingler (H.) 1982. Sur les monuments et papyri concernant Hermès-Thot, récemment identifiés ou découverts, cf. Fischer (J.) 1989 et Hagedorn (D.) 1987.

[3] *NH* VI, 63,11. Cf. Mahé 1988, p. 344, pour les principaux témoignages hermétiques sur la voie. Sur l'hermétisme en général comme voie, cf. *HHE* t.2, p. 455 s. et Fowden (G.) 1986, p. 111 s.

[4] Sur l'arrivée des premiers écrits hermétiques grecs en Europe, où l'on ne connaissait antérieurement que l'*Asclepius* latin, cf. *HHE* t.2, p. 3 s.

[5] Sur la chronologie des *Hermetica*, cf. *HHE* t.2, p. 25 s n. 139 et Mahé 1986, p. 51.

[6] Cf. Meleze-Modrzejewski (J.) 1986, p. 11s.

[7] Sur la création dans les *Hermetica*, cf. Mahé 1986. Sur le rapport des conceptions hermétiques avec les «anciens dieux» et les cosmogonies égyptiennes, cf. Iversen (E.) 1984 et Idem 1990.

[8] Cf. Mussies (G.) 1982, sur l'assimilation de Thot à Moïse.

[9] *La Prière d'action de grâces* (n° 2 de la liste établie ci-dessus p. 347): cf. *HHE* t.1 (p. 141-146. 160-167), dont nous modifions quelque peu la traduction.

[10] Le copte *sbô* paraît traduire ici, en *NH* VI, 64,7, une leçon ἐνάργειαν banalisée en ἐνέργειαν dans le Papyrus Mimaut (d'où *efficacia* dans l'*Ascl.*).

[11] On peut se demander, en *NH* VI, 64,12-13, si, au lieu de la leçon ἑρμηνεύσωμεν supposée par le copte et confirmée par *FH* 21, où Hermès-Logos «interprète» tous les êtres en leur donnant un nom, le modèle grec de l'*Asclepius* n'aurait pas eu ἐρευνήσωμεν/*suspicionibus indagemus* (cf. *SH* XXIII,45). Ἐπικαλήσωμεν du Papyrus Mimaut semble être une correction arbitraire du compilateur, sans doute due à une interprétation banalisante du mot λόγος.

[11a] Fowden (G.) 1986 (p. 101) s'appuie sur ce texte (*CH* X,9) — qu'il cite par erreur comme *CH* IX —, pour opposer la γνῶσις, produit "of understanding and faith, as evoked at the end of *CH* IX" (*CH* IX,10: νοῦς, νοήσις et πίστις), à l'ἐπιστήμη, produit du λόγος. Cela est formellement démenti par la suite immédiate du texte, puisqu'en *CH* X,10 l'ἐπιστήμη use du νοῦς comme d'un instrument; de plus en *CH* IV,6 le νοῦς a une ἐπιστήμη. On ne saurait non plus présenter l'ἐπιστήμη comme nécessairement inférieure à la γνῶσις, puisqu'elle peut en être issue (*NH* VI,66,11-13, mentionné par Fowden (G.), *ibidem* note 23; cf. *HHE* t.2, p. 155. 213). En fait l'ἐπιστήμη ne dépend du λογικόν que si elle est associée à la τέχνη (*SH* IV,1 s.; cf. *CH* X,22. XI,20). Quant à la γνῶσις, première intuition de la vie spirituelle, elle persiste tout au long de la voie, mais ce n'est qu'à la fin qu'elle coïncide avec l'illumination de l'intellect (*NH* VI,64,15-16).

[12] *HHE* t.1, p. 167.

[13] Fragment du *Discours Parfait* (n° 3 de la liste établie ci-dessus p. 347); sur le fait qu'il s'agit d'un extrait et non pas d'un discours complet, cf. *HHE* t.2, p. 49-51. L'appellation *Asclepius*, conservée pour le copte par Dirkse (P.A.), Parrott (D.M.) 1979, est gravement incorrecte. Sur la tradition latine de l'*Ascl.*, cf. Moreschini (C.) 1985, p. 69-202. 267-288.

[14] *HHE* t.2, p. 184-187. 194-197.

[15] *Ibidem*, p. 60 s.

[16] *Ibidem*, p. 204-207.

[17] *Ibidem*, p. 62-67. Pour toute la présentation ci-dessous du Fragment du *Discours Parfait*, nous renvoyons à notre commentaire, *ibidem*, p. 209-272.

[18] Mahé 1974, p. 126-133.

[19] Cf. Mahé 1986, p. 11 n. 3: il faut corriger γνώσεως du Papyrus Mimaut, non pas en φύσεως (*HHE* t.1, p. 164), mais en γενέσεως, qui correspond à la fois au copte *ϭo* «semence» et au latin *naturarum*.

[20] Mahé 1986, p. 10-15. Mes remarques sur les influences égyptiennes dans les *Hermetica* ont été critiquées par Fowden (G.) 1986. J'observe que ces critiques ne portent pas sur la prédiction d'Hermès à Asclépius (*DP*: *NH* VI[8]), dont les composantes égyptiennes sont tout à fait patentes, mais sur les liens que j'ai tenté d'établir entre les Sagesses égyptiennes et les *Définitions* (*DH*). Je maintiens, sur ces liens, une position qui n'a jamais consisté à dire que «the philosophical Hermetica are lineal descendants of the Egyptian instruction» (Fowden 1986, p. 72), mais que les *Hermetica* ont certains points communs avec les Sagesses: caractères formels (un père à son fils; style aphoristique; ébauches timides de dialogue), orientations spirituelles, affinités terminologiques, etc. J'ai d'ailleurs tenu à marquer les «limites de l'inspiration égyptienne» (*HHE* t.2, p. 305-308). En dehors des Sagesses, j'ai également cité des hymnes, quelquefois littéralement parallèles aux *Hermetica* (*HHE* t.2, p. 294). Je me satisfais parfaitement, en dehors de ces parallèles, d'avoir mis en évidence «a shared geographical and in the case of the latest instructions chronological ambience» (Fowden 1986, p. 71), du moment que cette ambiance se concrétise par des ressemblances phraséologiques aussi précises que celles que j'ai notées (*HHE* t.2, p. 291-292) et qui ont été confirmées, d'autre part, par des travaux indépendants des miens (cf. Ponsing (J.-P.) 1980).

[21] *HHE* t.2, p. 252 s.

[22] *Ibidem*, p. 264-270.

[23] Sur les hiérarchies divines dans le *Discours Parfait*, cf. Baltes (M.) 1988, p. 51.

[24] *Pap. Vind. gr.* (n° 4 de la liste établie ci-dessus p. 347).

[25] Oellacher (H.) 1951, p. 182 et la lettre de Frau Dr. H. Löbenstein du 10 août 1983, citée par Mahé 1984, p. 61.

[26] Néanmoins, si l'on accepte l'affirmation de *CH* x,1 que «ce discours n'est qu'un résumé (ἐπιτομή) des *Leçons Générales*» à Tat, fait à l'intention d'Asclépius (cf. *CH* xiv,1), on pourrait en déduire que ces leçons étaient consacrées aux trois êtres, Dieu, le monde et l'homme (mais c'est aussi le plan de *CH* viii) et à la remontée vers Dieu.

[27] Liddell-Scott 1968, p. 596: «ἐξοδικός = διεξοδικός, θεωρίαι, Syrianus, in *Metaphysica commentaria* 24,14». Dirkse (P.A.), Brashler (J.) 1979, p. 371, préfèrent maintenir que ἐξοδιακός est un adjectif non attesté, dérivé de ἐξοδία et signifiant «pertaining to a journey». Même s'il s'agit d'un périple spirituel, cela ne nous paraît guère vraisemblable.

[28] διεξοδικός «détaillé» est l'interprétation d'A.-J. Festugière dans *FH* 30 et 33. A.D. Nock (*NF* t.4, p. 136 n. 1) propose «systématique», mais estime qu'il s'agit «surtout d'un mot sonore». Nous pensons, au contraire, qu'il s'agit d'un terme technique précis qui implique à la fois détail et exhaustivité: cf. διεξέρχομαι «parcourir entièrement» (*SH* xi,1) et le sens de ἐξοδικῶς (Liddell-Scott 1968, p. 596) «from beginning to end».

[29] *HHE* t.2, p. 423 s.; Van den Broek (R.), Quispel (G.) 1990, p. 17: «Van spreuk tot tractaat».

[30] *HHE* t.2, p. 437. Cette position, fondée sur la comparaison des traités hermétiques avec les collections de sentences (*DH* et *SH* xi), n'a rien à voir avec le «grand Darwinian design» que me prête Fowden (G.) 1986, p. 71, puisque j'ai eu soin de préciser (*HHE* t.2, p. 416) que «l'ordonnance des faits que nous présentons...n'est pas chronologique mais typologique» et que je n'affirme pas «que les assemblages les plus simples... sont nécessairement les plus anciens et que les assemblages les plus complexes...sont les plus récents». Les résultats matériels d'une analyse philologique ne sauraient, en eux-mêmes, «lack historical realism» (Fowden 1986, p. 72), pour la simple raison qu'ils se contentent de constater des faits, sans prendre position sur la façon dont ceux-ci ont pu se réaliser dans le temps, c'est-à-dire sans empiéter sur la tâche spécifique de l'historien.

[31] *Définitions* hermétiques (n° 5 de la liste établie ci-dessus p. 348).

[32] Cf. Mahé 1976; cf. aussi De Durand (G.M.) 1976, dont la traduction parut peu après la mienne.

[33] Quispel (G.) 1981, p. 260 s.

[34] Cf. *HHE* t.2, p. 278.

[35] A condition de ne pas prendre au mot l'insinuation de G. Fowden (1986, p. 10): «the *Definitions* offer an interesting parallel to the dismemberment of the *Perfect discourse* performed during the prehistory of N.H.C. (VI)». Supposer que les *DH* résultent du «démembrement» de divers traités hermétiques paraît peu vraisemblable, étant donné que certaines définitions, parallèles à plusieurs traités à la fois, n'ont manifestement été tirées d'aucun d'entre eux; c'est plutôt l'inverse qui s'est produit. Quant à prétendre qu'il y a eu aussi un «démembrement» du *DP* par le compilateur de *NH* vi, il faut observer que *NH* vi[8] est assurément un fragment (cf. *supra* n. 13), mais que l'argument avancé par G. Fowden (1986, p. 6) pour soutenir que *NH* vi[7] est aussi dérivé du *DP*, «because it includes part of the narrative framework of that treatise», est nettement insuffisant. En effet, le

«cadre narratif» en question (*NH* VI, 65,3-7) **1°** est en fait l'indication d'un rite trop général (baiser de paix et agape après la prière) pour être spécifiquement lié au *DP* **2°** ce cadre est indissociable du titre «Voici la prière qu'ils ont dite» (*NH* VI, 66,33), qu' *Ascl.*, version libre du *DP*, supprime probablement à la suite de sa source **3°** le changement de personne («ils s'embrassèrent» [*NH* VI, 65,4]/*convertimus nos* [*Ascl.*41]) traduit évidemment une adaptation, par l'auteur du *DP*, de la troisième personne originale de la source conservée par le copte.

[36] Voir les notes de *HHE* t.2, p. 358-403.

[37] *Ibidem*.

[38] *HHE* t.2, p. 330-333.

[39] *Ibidem*, p. 328-329.

[40] Six extraits grecs (n° 8 de la liste établie ci-dessus p. 348).

[41] Edition Paramelle (J.), Mahé (J.-P.) 1991 B.

[42] On en apprécie d'autant plus la qualité de la version arménienne et de la tradition manuscrite, notamment de la branche ξ représentée par des manuscrits plus tardifs (XVIIe s.) que ceux de la branche ψ (dont le manuscrit le plus ancien date de 1273, cf. *HHE* t.2, p. 323).

[43] Sur les difficultés qui subsistent cf. Paramelle, Mahé 1991 B, n. 15. Il faut en tout cas renoncer à la correction proposée en *HHE* t.2, p. 389-391 et n. 5 (*DH* IX,1); la leçon arménienne la plus proche du grec est celle du manuscrit *A*

[44] Cinq extraits grecs sur l'âme et la procréation de l'homme (n° 9 de la liste établie ci-dessus p. 348): Paramelle (J.), Mahé (J.-P.) 1991 A.

[45] Il est difficile de savoir, étant donné le caractère fragmentaire du texte, si l'on ne devrait pas distinguer un plus grand nombre d'extraits. Il est notamment possible qu'un sixième développement commence à la fin de notre extrait 5 (cf. Paramelle, Mahé 1991 A).

[46] Cela peut être un indice de datation, si l'on observe qu' A.-J. Festugière (*NF* t.3, p. CXIII) décèle dans *SH* XV l'influence de «l'Ecole pneumatique», qui «date au plus tôt du IIIe siècle de notre ère».

[47] *H Syr.* (n° 7 de la liste établie ci-dessus p. 348). Sur la place de ces collections de sentences philosophiques dans la littérature syriaque, cf. Brock (S.) 1982, p. 27 et p. 34 n. 118.

[48] Cf. Erbse (H.) 1941, p. 167-201.

[49] Par exemple, dans Brock (S.) 1983 (p. 216.228.237), les deux fragments du § 4 du texte syriaque, qui ne figurent pas dans les *FH* 23-27 (cf. note suivante), sont édités par Scott (W.) et Ferguson (A.S.), t.4, p. 233-235, dans les extraits de Malalas, du *Chronicon Paschale* et de Cedrenus.

[50] Par exemple, dans Brock (S.) 1983, le § 4 contient, après l'extrait mentionné ci-dessous des extraits de *FH* 24. 23. 27, et un serment par le ciel, conservé chez Malalas; le § 14 est un extrait de *FH* 27; le § 21 est tiré de *CH* XIII, 1-4. Dans Brock (S.) 1984, *Syr. C* § 1 correspond à *FH* 22 A (mais le texte grec n'était pas connu d'A.D. Nock).

[51] Brock (S.) 1983 (§ 4, p. 228).

[52] *Ibidem* p. 237: "Hermès Trismégiste l'Egyptien, un homme redoutable en sagesse, qui déclara que le nom du (Dieu) ineffable et créateur comporte trois suprêmes hypostases, mais dit qu'il s'agit d'une unique divinité. C'est pourquoi il fut appelé Hermès Trismégiste d'après les Egyptiens" (cf. W. Scott, A.S. Ferguson, t.4, p. 233).

[53] *P G* 121, 64 = Scott, Ferguson, t.4, p. 235.

[54] *P G* 92, 169 s = Scott, Ferguson, *ibidem*.

[55] *Témoignages des philosophes du dehors sur la divinité*, court fragment en arménien (n° 6 de la liste établie ci-dessus p. 348).

[56] Comme, par exemple, l'extrait 19 de Brock (S.) 1983 p. 230, [«*Hermes, on the Father and on the Son*: Therefore he resembles the power of the father who is with him. (The son is therefore in the father and the father in the son), for he is the cause for everything to come into being; child of the father, who is light of light, who is from fire and with fire; so too the mind which is with the father is also the word in light»], qui ne coïncide que pour quelques mots avec *FH* 23, mais représente un autre texte, sans doute partiellement christianisé, comme le suggère la paraphrase de *Jn* 14,10, que j'ai mise entre parenthèses dans la traduction de S. Brock.

[57] Bien qu'il soit difficile d'en juger hors contexte, on peut supposer que, dans l'extrait syriaque de la note précédente, l'Inengendré est le Père, l'Autogène est l'Intellect, c'est-à-dire la Puissance du Père, à laquelle le Fils ressemble, et la Lumière dont le Fils est issu comme une autre Lumière; inversement cet Intellect est Verbe en puissance dans la Lumière qui lui est propre; l'Engendré est le Fils, enfant du Père, Verbe de l'Intellect, Lumière et feu comme lui. Il y aurait sans doute lieu de comparer la procession des hypostases ainsi décrite avec celle du valentinisme, tel que nous le connaissons par la grande notice d'Irénée sur la doctrine de Ptolémée.

[58] Cf. *supra* n. 28. J. Moingt nous suggère de comparer cette valeur exhaustive du préfixe δι-εξ- avec celle de δια- en *Jn* 24,27: Καὶ ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ Μωϋσέως καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν προφητῶν *διηρμήνευσεν* αὐτοῖς ἐν πάσαις ταῖς γραφαῖς τὰ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ. Le verbe pourrait en effet convenir à Hermès qui «interprète» (c'est-à-dire nomme du nom qui lui revient en propre) chacun des êtres, exhaustivement.

[59] Cf. *RHT* t.4, p. 62-70.

[60] Cf. Mahé 1984, p. 59 (d'après *FH* 3 A).

[61] Cf. *Ascl.* 20.

[62] Bien qu'ils soient d'une orientation entièrement différente, ces exercices spirituels hermétiques sont comparables aux exercices stoïciens et épicuriens décrits par P. Hadot (1981).

[63] Cf. l'usage de εἰκών en *CH* V,2.6, *CH* XIV,10, *CH* XVI (titre), *NH* VI, 65,16 s.

[64] Cf. *HHE* t.2, p. 209-210 pour la structure syntaxique propre à ces exercices: «Si tu veux contempler (θεάσασθαι, θεωρῆσαι)..., vois...».

[65] Cf. *Ascl.* 21: «ex intimo sensu»; *CH* I,7: « je vois dans mon intellect».

[66] *CH* XI,14: ἴδε τί *σοι ἐγγίνεται*...

[67] Comparer avec *Evangile de Thomas* (*NH* II et *P Oxy* 654): «Le Royaume est à l'intérieur de nous et il est à l'extérieur de nous» (§ 3) et «Quand vous ferez l'intérieur comme l'extérieur...» (§ 22), Puech (H.-Ch.) 1978, t.2, p. 11. 13-14 et 270 s.

[68] Cf. *RHT* t.4, p. 199.

[69] Il s'agit d'une sorte d'admiration extatique, comme en *SH* VI,18 ou *CH* XIV,4: «Concevoir et dès lors admirer, et ceci fait s'estimer bienheureux puisqu'on a connu le Père»; cf. *Evangile de Thomas* (§ 2): «Que celui qui cherche ne cesse pas de chercher jusqu'à ce qu'il trouve et, quand il trouvera, il sera troublé et, ayant été troublé, il sera émerveillé et il régnera sur le Tout» (H.-Ch. Puech 1978, t.2, p. 11). Sur la puissance d'admiration comme constitutive des plus hautes facultés humaines et étape de la remontée vers Dieu, cf. Mahé 1989, p. 126.

[70] *L'Ogdoade et l'Ennéade* (n° 1 de la liste établie ci-dessus, p. 347). Sur de possibles influences égyptiennes dans ce mystère hermétique de régénération, voir *HHE* t.1, p. 33-38 et Motte (L.) 1989, p. 130 s.

[71] *HHE* t.1, p. 37-41.

[72] Mahé 1988 B, p. 167-169.

[73] *Ibidem* p. 161 s. sur la Décade.

[74] Cf. le témoignage édité par H.-Ch. Puech 1946 (1978), p. 117 s., où Hermès s'est «souvenu de lui-même» ou «reconnu lui-même», lors de sa troisième incarnation, méritant ainsi son nom véritable de Trismégiste. Ce qui est frappant, c'est que l'initiation remplace cette expérience intellectuelle, en quelque sorte médiatisée par la réflexion, par un vécu immédiat et direct: «Je me vois moi-même».

[75] Cf. Mahé 1986, p. 35 s. Il faut comparer cet homme un et quadruple à l'Homme de *Jn* 19,5, reconnu par Pilate, dont les «vêtements» sont divisés en quatre parts, sauf la tunique sans couture, qui est d'une seule pièce (*Jn* 19, 23-24).

[76] Mahé 1987, p. 146.

[77] *Ibidem* p. 139; Tardieu (M.) 1984, p. 171.176.

[78] Tröger (K.W.) 1971, p. VIII. 167; arguments contraires dans *HHE* t.1, p. 54-59. La démonstration qu'il s'agit d'un rite réel a été brillamment reprise par R. Van den Broek dans son intervention au colloque signalé supra, note*.

[79] Paul Valéry, *Le cimetière marin*, strophe 2.

SIGLES USUELS CONCERNANT L'HERMÉTISME

Ascl.	*Asclepius* (adaptation latine de *DP*) in *NF* t. 2 + *HHE* t. 2.
BCNH	Bibliothèque Copte de Nag Hammadi, Québec.
CH	(*Corpus Hermeticum*) *CH* I-XII in *NF* t. 1; *CH* XIII-XIV + XVI-XVIII in *NF* t. 2. Il n'existe pas de *CH* XV.
DH	*Définitions d'Hermès Trismégiste à Asclépius* (en traduction arménienne) in *HHE* t. 2. et J. PARAMELLE - J.-P. MAHÉ 1991 B, *Revue des Etudes Arméniennes* 22 (1990-91), pour les fragments grecs.
DP	*Discours Parfait*: Λόγος Τέλειος, source d'*Ascl.* et de *NH* VI[8].
FH	*Fragmenta Hermetica*: *FH* 1-36 in *NF* t. 4.
HHE	J.-P. MAHÉ, *Hermès en Haute-Egypte*, 2 vol., Québec, 1978-1982 (*BCNH* 3.7).
HO	*Hermetica Oxoniensia* I-V: J. PARAMELLE - J.-P. MAHÉ 1991 A, *Revue des Etudes Grecques* 1991.
HSyr	*Hermetica Syriaca*: S. BROCK «A Syriac Collection of Prophecies of the Pagan Philosophers», *Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica* 14 (1983) p. 203-246 (spécialement p. 230-231). «Some Syriac Excerpts from Greek Collections of Pagan Prophecies», *Vigiliae Christianae* 38 (1984) p. 77-90 (spécialement 83-84.86).
KK	*Κόρη Κόσμου* = *SH* XXIII in *NF* t.4, selon le titre de l'extrait et l'usage reçu. En fait *SH* XXIV est aussi extrait de *KK*, *SH* XXV-XXVII proviennent, soit du même écrit, soit d'autres discours d'Isis à Horus.
NF	*Hermès Trismégiste*, éd. trad. A.D. NOCK - A.-J. FESTUGIÈRE, 4 vol., Paris 1945-1954.

NH I-XIII	Codices coptes de Nag Hammadi, contenant les écrits hermétiques suivants: *NH* VI[6] (p. 52,1-63,32), *L'Ogdoade et l'Ennéade* (*HHE* t. 1); *NH* VI[7] (p. 63,33 - 65,7), *Prière d'action de grâces* (*HHE* t. 1); *NH* VI[8] (p. 65,14 - 78,43), *Fragment du Λόγος Τέλειος* (*HHE* t. 2) + d'autres écrits plus ou moins nettement influencés par l'hermétisme (les titres en italique ne figurent pas sur le codex).
Pap. Vind. gr.	J.-P. MAHÉ, «Fragments hermétiques dans les Papyri Vindobonenses Graecae 29456 r° et 29828 r°», *Mémorial A.-J. Festugière, Antiquité païenne et chrétienne*, éd. E. Lucchesi - H.D. Saffrey, (Cahiers d'Orientalisme 10), Genève 1984, p. 51-64.
Poimandrès	*CH* I in *NF* t. 1.
RHT	A.-J. FESTUGIÈRE, *La Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste*, 4 vol., Paris 1942-1953 (réimpression: Belles Lettres, Paris 1983).
SH	*Stobaei Hermetica*: *SH* I-XXII in *NF* t. 3; *SH* XXIII-XXIX in *NF* t. 4.

BIBLIOGRAPHIE

Baltes (M.) 1988. «Zur Theologie des Xenokrates», in Van den Broek (R.) 1988, p. 43-68

Bertolini (M.) 1985. «Sul lessico filosofico dell' *Asclepius*», *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* 15 (1985), p. 1151-1209

Bonardel (F.) 1985. *L'hermétisme*, collection «Que sais-je?», Paris 1985

Brock (S.) 1982. «From Antagonism to Assimilation: Syriac Attitudes to Greek Learning» in Garsoïan (N.G.), Mathews (Th.F.), Thomson (R.W.), *East of Byzantium: Syria and Armenia in the Formative Period*, Washington (Dumbarton Oaks) 1982, p. 17-34

Brock (S.) 1983. «A Syriac Collection of Prophecies of the Pagan Philosophers», *Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica* 14 (1983), p. 203-246

Brock (S.) 1984. «Some Syriac Excerpts from Greek Collections of Pagan Prophecies», *Vigiliae Christianae* 38 (1984), p. 77-90

Büchli (J.) 1987. *Der Poimandres. Ein paganisiertes Evangelium. Sprachliche Untersuchungen zum 1 Traktat des Corpus Hermeticum* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, Reihe 2:27), Tübingen 1987

Camplani (A.) 1986. «Alcune note sul testo del VI codice di Nag Hammadi. La predizione di Hermes ad Asclepius», *Augustinianum* 26 (1986), p. 349-368

De Durand (G.M.) 1976. «Un traité hermétique conservé en arménien», *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* 190 (1976), p. 55-72

De Santis (C.) 1987. «Gli scritti hermetici del sesto codice di Nag Hammadi», *Studi e materiali di storia delle religioni* 11 (1987), p. 57-65

Di Carlo (F.) 1981. *Litteratura e ideologia dell' ermetismo*, Foggia Bastegi 1981

Dirkse (P.A.), Brashler (J.) 1979. «The Prayer of Thanksgiving», in Parrott (D.M.) 1979, p. 375-387

Dirkse (P.A.), Brashler (J.), Parrott (D.M.) 1979. «The Discourse on the Eighth and Ninth», in Parrott (D.M.) 1979, p. 341-373

Dirkse (P.A.), Parrott (D.M.) 1979. «Asclepius 21-29», in Parrott (D.M.) 1979, p. 395-451

Erbse (H.) 1941. *Fragmente griechischer Theosophien*, Hamburg 1941

Filorano (G.) 1982. *Le religioni di salvezza del mondo antico II: l'ermetismo filosofico* (Corso di storia delle religioni 1978-1979), Turin 1982

Fischer (J.) 1989. «Ein später Ptolemäer als Hermes-Thot. Neue Beobachtungen am sog. Apion im Württembergischen Landesmuseum Stuttgart», *Archäologischer Anzeiger* 1989 n° 1, p. 43-55

Fowden (G.) 1986. *The Egyptian Hermes. A Historical Approach to the Late Pagan Mind*, Cambridge 1986

González Blanco (A.) 1984. «Hermetism. A Bibliographical Approach», *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt*, II, 17, 4, 1984, p. 2240-2281

Hadot (P.) 1981. *Exercices spirituels et philosophie antique*, Paris 1981 [Recueil d'articles écrits à partir de 1974]

Hagedorn (D.) 1987. «Drei Miszellen zu Papyrusurkunden», *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 67 (1987), p. 97-104 [Papyrus d'Hermopolis CPR VI,72, 1er s. avant J.-C., concernant Hermès-Thot]

Hornik (H.) 1975. «The Philosophical Hermetica; their History and Meaning», *Atti della Accademia delle Scienze di Torino* 109 (1975), p. 343-392

Iversen (E.) 1984. *Egyptian and Hermetic Doctrine*, Copenhagen 1984

Iversen (E.) 1990. «The Cosmogony of the Shabaka Text», in Israelit-Groll (S.), *Studies in Egyptology Presented to Miriam Lichtheim*, Jerusalem 1990, p. 485-493

Krause (M.), Labib (P.) 1971. *Gnostische und Hermetische Schriften aus Codex II und Codex VI*, Glückstadt 1971

Liddell (H.G.), Scott (R.) 1968. *A Greek English Lexicon* (Revised...by H.S. Jones and R. Mc Kenzie, with a Supplement), Oxford 1988

Mahé (J.-P.) 1975. «Le sens des symboles sexuels dans quelques textes hermétiques et gnostiques», in Ménard (J.E.), *Les textes de Nag Hammadi* (Nag Hammadi Studies VII), Leiden 1975, p. 123-145

Mahé (J.-P.) 1976. «Les *Définitions* d'Hermès Trismégiste à Asclépius», *Revue des Sciences Religieuses* 50 (1976), p. 193-214

Mahé (J.-P.) 1978. *Hermès en Haute-Egypte*, t.1, Québec 1978 (= HHE t.1)

Mahé (J.-P.) 1982. *Hermès en Haute-Egypte*, t.2, Québec 1982 (= HHE t.2)

Mahé (J.-P.) 1984. «Fragments hermétiques dans les Papyri Vindobonenses Graecae 28456 r° et 29828 r°», in Lucchesi (E.), Saffrey (H.D.), *Mémorial A.-J. Festugière. Antiquité païenne et chrétienne* (Cahiers d'Orientalisme 10), Genève 1984, p. 51-64

Mahé (J.-P.) 1986. «La création dans les *Hermetica*», *Recherches Augustiniennes* 21 (1986), p. 3-53

Mahé (J.-P.) 1987. «Παλιγγενεσία et structure du monde supérieur dans les *Hermetica* et le traité d'*Eugnoste* de Nag Hammadi», *Deuxième journée d'études coptes*, Strasbourg 25 mai 1984 (*Cahiers de la Bibliothèque Copte* 3), Louvain 1987, p. 137-149

Mahé (J.-P.) 1988 A. «L'hermétisme alexandrin», *Le Grand Atlas des Religions* (Encyclopaedia Universalis), Paris 1988, p. 344-345

Mahé (J.-P.) 1988 B. «Générations antédiluviennes et chute des éons dans l'hermétisme et dans la gnose», in Van den Broek (R.) 1988, p. 160-177

Mahé (J.-P.) 1989. «Paraphrase de Sem et Corpus Hermétique», *Etudes Coptes III, Troisième journée d'études coptes*, Musée du Louvre 23 mai 1986 (*Cahiers de la Bibliothèque Copte* 4), Louvain 1989, p. 124-127

Manandyan (H.), Arevšatyan (S.) 1956. «Hermeay Eṙameci aṙ Askłepios Sahmankᶜ»

(Définitions d'Hermès Trismégiste à Asclépius), *Banber Matenadarani* 3 (1956, Erévan), p. 287-314

Meleze-Modrzejewski (J.) 1986. «Livres sacrés et justice lagide», in Mélanges C. Kunderewicz (Acta Universitatis Lodziensis), *Folia Iuridica* 21 (1986), p. 11-44

Moreschini (C.) 1985. *Dall' Asclepius a/ Crater Hermetis. Studi sull' ermetismo latino tardo-antico e rinascimentale*, Pisa 1985

Motte (L.) 1989. «La vache multicolore et les trois pierres de la régénération», *Etudes Coptes III, Troisième journée d'études coptes*, Musée du Louvre 23 mai 1986 (*Cahiers de la Bibliothèque Copte* 4), Louvain 1989, p. 130-149

Mussies (G.) 1982. «The Interpretatio Judaïca of Thot-Hermes», in Heerma van Voss (M.) et alii, *Studies in Egyptian Religion Dedicated to Professor Jan Zandee*, Leiden 1982, p. 89-120

Oellacher (H.) 1951. «Papyrus und Pergamentfragmente aus Wiener und Münchener Beständen», *Miscellanea Giovanni Galbiati*, vol. 2 (Fontes Ambrosiani XXVI), Milan 1951, p. 182-188

Paramelle (J.), Mahé (J.-P.) 1991 A. «Extraits hermétiques inédits dans un manuscrit d'Oxford», *Revue des Etudes Grecques* 1991 (sous presse)

Paramelle (J.), Mahé (J.-P.) 1991 B. «Nouveaux parallèles grecs aux *Définitions* hermétiques arméniennes», *Revue des Etudes Arméniennes* 22 (1990-1991), sous presse

Parrott, (D.M.) 1979. *Nag Hammadi Codices V, 2-5 and VI with the Papyrus Berolinensis 8502, 1 and 4* (Nag Hammadi Studies 11), Leiden 1979

Ponsing (J.-P.) 1980. «L'origine égyptienne de la formule: Un-et-Seul», *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* 60 (1980), p. 29-34

Puech (H.-Ch.) 1946 (1978). «Hermès trois fois incarné. Sur quelques témoignages négligés relatifs à l'hermétisme», *Revue des Etudes Grecques* 59-60 (1946-1947), p. XI-XIII. Repris dans *En quête de la gnose*, tome 1: *La gnose et le temps*, Paris 1978, p. 117-118

Puech (H.-Ch.) 1978. *En quête de la gnose*, tome 2: *L'Evangile selon Thomas*, Paris 1978

Quispel (G.) 1981. «The Gospel of Thomas Revisited», in Barc (B.), *Colloque international sur Nag Hammadi* (Bibliothèque Copte de Nag Hammadi, Etudes 1), Québec 1981, p. 218-266

Russell i Mayo (A.) 1984. «*Kore Kosmu*. Traducció del fragment XXIII del Llibre d'Estobeu», *Annario de Filologia* (Faculdad de Filologia, Barcelona) 10 (1984), p. 39-63

Scott (W.), Ferguson (A.S.) 1924-1936. *Hermetica*, 4 vol., Oxford 1924-1936

Segal (R.A.) 1987. *The Poimandres as Myth, Scholarly Theory and Gnostic Learning*, Amsterdam 1987

Tardieu (M.) 1984. *Ecrits gnostiques. Codex de Berlin*, Sources Gnostiques et Manichéennes 1, Paris 1984

Theron (D.J.) 1981. *Paul's Concept of Aletheia. A Comparative Study with the Hermetic Literature*, Diss. Princeton N.J. 1950, cf. *Dissertation Abstracts* 41 (1981), p. 172 A

Tröger (K.W.) 1971. *Mysterienglaube und Gnosis in CH XIII* (T U 110), Berlin 1971

Van den Broek (R.) et alii 1988. *Knowledge of God in the Graeco-Roman World* (EPROER 112), Leiden 1988

Van den Broek (R.), Quispel (G.) 1990. *Corpus Hermeticum* (trad.), Amsterdam 1990

Van Esbroeck (M.) 1986. «L'apport des versions orientales pour la compréhension de l'*Asclepius* dans les *Philosophica* d'Apulée», in Pavan (M.), Cozzoli (K.), *L'eredità classica nelle lingue orientali*, Roma 1986, p. 27-35

Van Lamoen (F.) 1990. *Hermes Trismegistus Pater Philosophorum, Tekstgeschiedenis van het Corpus Hermeticum*, Amsterdam 1990

Wessely (C.), *Mitteilungen aus der Sammlung PER*, V, 3, Wien

Whitehouse (D.J.M.) 1986. *The Hymns of the Corpus Hermeticum*, Diss. Harvard University, Cambridge Mass. 1985, cf. *Dissertation Abstracts* 46 (1986), p. 2231 A

Wingler (H.) 1982. «Der Symbolbegriff des Neuplatonismus und sein Nachleben in der Hermetik», in Lurker (M.), *Beiträge zu Symbol, Symbolbegriff und Symbolforschung*, Baden-Baden 1982, p. 207-215

Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes, Sorbonne, *Paris*.

Vigiliae Christianae 45 (1991), 376-387, E. J. Brill, Leiden

THE «AUGUSTINUS-LEXIKON»

BY

JOHANNES VAN OORT

Augustinus-Lexikon, edited by Cornelius Mayer, in association with Erich Feldmann, Wilhelm Geerlings, Reinhart Herzog, Serge Lancel, Goulven Madec, Gerard O'Daly, Alfred Schindler, Otto Wermelinger, Antonie Wlosok. Redaction Karl Heinz Chelius. Vol. 1, Fasc. 1/2, Basel and Stuttgart 1986, p. I-LI, col. 1-320; Fasc. 3, Basel 1988, p. LIII-LV, col. 321-480; Fasc. 4, Basel 1990, p. LVII-LX, col. 481-640.

There is no doubt that we may welcome the *Augustinus-Lexikon* as one of the most important patristic projects of our time.

After a decade of preparatory work, the first double fascicle was published in the commemorative year 1986. Fascicle 3 followed in 1988 and fascicle 4 in 1990. As anticipated the complete work will consist of 32 fascicles comprising a total of 5120 columns collected in four volumes. A separate fifth volume will contain the various indices.

Such a full-scale and ambitious undertaking deserves special notice in a journal like this. The *AL*, it is true, is not the first attempt to procure access to Augustine's œuvre, but it forms part of an impressive tradition. Already c. 450 Prosper of Aquitaine excerpted the works of his venerated master in a *Liber sententiarum* (new edition by M. Gastaldo in CCL 68A), which was followed shortly after that by a *Liber epigrammatum ex sententiis s. Augustini* of the same author. The following centuries repeatedly showed similar endeavours with the special purpose of disclosing Augustine's world of thought, *inter alia* Eugippius' *Excerpta ex operibus s. Augustini* in the eighth century, several "*libri florum b. Augustini*" in later times, and culminating in Bartholomaeus of Urbino's famous *Milleloquium s. Augustini* (c. 1345, first printed in Lyon 1555).[1] In the seventeenth century, characterized with good reason as 'the Age of Augustine',[2] David Lenfant produced his impressive *Concordantiae Augustinianae* in two volumes (Paris 1656-1665; repr. Brussels 1966), followed by his now very rare *Biblia Augustiniana* (Paris

1678). Shortly afterwards, in 1679, the Benedictines of St Maurus began publishing their famous edition which was provided with extensive and still valuable indices. Useful indices encompassing Augustine's works are also found in most modern editions (CSEL, CCL, BA). Nevertheless, all these instruments are limited and can only be considered a provisional means of help. They do not provide a complete access to Augustine's works, his personality and his world of thought, the milieu in which he lived and from which he underwent different influences. It is for this reason that a great deal of work has been done since the early seventies to prepare an Augustine lexicon that meets this needs. In 1976 an editorial board was constituted, and today the first fascicles are at the disposal of a wide circle of interested persons.

Looking into these first four fascicles which have a total of LX pages and 640 columns, one is certainly impressed by the amount of work that has been done by the editors and their co-workers. Yet what has been published so far (in all, the first half of volume I) is not the only result of this extensive international project. Initially to give the authors the opportunity to do their work as thoroughly as possible, in 1980-1983 a complete Augustine concordance was compiled through computer processing (the Augustinian corpus contains more than 5,025,000 words). This concordance is now available to every scholar, wherever he may be working.[3] In addition to this, since 1983, a bibliography is being compiled which is as relevant and, from 1970 on, as complete as possible. In accordance with computer processing methods, new or forgotten publications can easily be added to this bibliography. Thus this instrument will also become increasingly an indispensable and vital means of help to those studying Augustine. Here we would express the wish that at a certain moment this working tool will be published too. For even the use of the excellent bibliography composed by T.[J.] van Bavel (*Répertoire bibliographique de Saint Augustin 1950-1960*, Steenbrugge and The Hague 1963), the less estimable but concise and useful one of C. Andresen (*Bibliographia Augustiniana*, Darmstadt ²1973), or the annual and almost complete *Bulletin Augustinien* published in the *Revue des Études Augustiniennes*, occasionally leaves one with some desiderata. A new bibliography from the University of Giessen would therefore certainly perform a meritorious service.[4]

The reasons why an Augustine lexicon is considered necessary, the objectives of the editor and co-editors, and their methods to accomplish their purpose, are elaborated lucidly in a trilingual introduction (V-

XXII). There the exact purpose of the editors is stated briefly as follows (XIII): "The Augustinus-Lexikon deals in alphabetical order with concepts, persons, places, institutions, and objects which are of importance for [sc. a study of] Augustine's life, work, and teaching. It provides factual information, but situates it in larger contexts whose complex ramifications are, as appropriate, elucidated. The presentation, therefore, not merely takes Augustine's biography and writings fully into account, but also treats of his position in Church politics, the personalities of his milieu, as well as the whole contemporary context. The enormous variety and scope of Augustine's influence, as well as the fact that much scholarly work remains to be done on it, mean that the history of his importance for posterity is, with the exception of occasional observations in individual articles, excluded."[5]

After some valuable directions for use, a complete enumeration of Augustine's works is given. This catalogue is of special value, for it provides excellent information on the authoritative text editions of our time. Besides, in composing this list some conscious decisions had to be made about the often difficult question of why, or why not, a work is authentic. It is understandable that the editors have listed the sermons which were discovered after the Maurists' edition in the traditional way (these sermons were published as "Sermones post Maurinos reperti" in *Miscellanea Agostiniana* I, Roma 1930; what has been found since then has generally been published in the *Revue Bénédictine*), and that in doing so they did not follow the very carefully constituted but unfortunately little known system of Verbraken (cf. P.-P. Verbraken, *Études critiques sur les sermons authentiques de Saint Augustin*, Steenbrugge and The Hague 1976). One can also accept the fact that, as in Almuth Mutzenbecher's distinguished edition of the *Retractationes* (CCL 57, Turnhout 1984, 1 and 7), preference is given to the title *De Academicis* over the well-known *Contra Academicos*; this is especially justified by Augustine's own wording in *retr.* 1, 1, 1. From the said *Retractationes* edition (p. 100), it is true, one can moreover defend the metathesis of the letter 'h' in *De cathecizandis rudibus* - this metathesis is also present in Possidius' *Indiculum* X^{3},7: "Cathecismi liber unus"; cf. A. Wilmart, "Operum S. Augustini elenchus a Possidio ... digestus", *MAg* II, 179-, but on the other hand J.B. Bauer does not mention it in respect to the manuscripts of *De catechizandis rudibus* consulted by him (cf. CCL 46, 121). It is questionable, therefore, whether such a variant should gain acceptance through an authoritative work as this lexicon certainly will

be. A similar problem occurs with *De rhetorica* sive *De rethorica*; in this case the editors did not follow the *Retractationes*, but they rightly decided in favour of C. Halm's edition and consequently their abbreviation is "*rhet.*". However, a consistent rendering of the titles in accordance with the *retr.*, in the case of the anti-Manichaean works results in the spelling "Manich*ae*us" on one occasion (*Contra epistulam Manichaei*), but on most other occasions one finds "Manich*e*us", "Manich*ei*", etc. (see also the list "Abbreviations of titles of Augustine's works": XLII-XLIV). On the other hand, in the Latin quotations and in the references to coming articles (e.g. →Faustus Manichaeus, →Felix Manichaeus, →Manichaei) the first mentioned and usual spelling is always found. This method of working will certainly raise legitimate questions from non-specialists, and we may ask if they should not have been avoided.

After the lists of abbreviations (books of the Bible; Greek and Latin writers and their works; series, periodicals,[6] editions, etc.: XLV-LI; supplementary lists LIII-LV and LVII-LX) the proper part of the lexicon follows, i.e., the articles. In order to provide an impression of their rich content we first give a complete enumeration:

Fasc. 1/2: *Aaron* (J. Pintard), *Abel* (Y. Congar), *Abeloim* (O. Wermelinger), *Abortus* (idem), *Abraham* (C. Mayer), *Abstinentia-continentia* (A. Zumkeller), *Academia* (M. Baltes), *Academicis* (*De* -) (B.R. Voss), *Accedit verbum ad elementum, et fit sacramentum* (Mayer), *Accidens* (G.C. Stead), *Acta contra Fortunatum Manicheum* (F. Decret), *Actio-contemplatio* (G.J.P. O'Daly and L. Verheijen), *Adam* (G. Bonner), *Adeodatus* (G. Madec), *Adimantum Manichaei discipulum* (*Contra*-) (F. Decret), *Adimantus* (idem), *Adiutorium quo, adiutorium sine quo non* (Mayer), *Admonitio* (Madec), *Admonitio Donatistarum de Maximianistis* (A. Schindler), *Adnotationes in Iob* (W. Geerlings), *Aduentus Christi* (idem), *Aduersarium legis et prophetarum* (*Contra* -) (T. Raveaux), *Adulatio* (Zumkeller), *Adulterinis coniugiis* (*De* -) (A.-M. La Bonnardière), *Adulterium* (eadem), *Aegyptus* (A. Di Berardino), *Aenigma* (Mayer), *Aequalitas* (Mayer and B. Studer), *Aetas* (B. Kötting and Geerlings), *Aeternitas* (O'Daly), *Afer, Afri* (S. Lancel), *Affectus* (*passio, perturbatio*) (O'Daly and Zumkeller), *Africa* (C. Lepelley and S. Lancel), *Agon* (W. Weismann), *Agone christiano* (*De* -) (Zumkeller), *Agrippinus episcopus Carthaginiensis* (Ch. Munier), *Alienatio* (Mayer), *Allegoria* (idem), *Alleluia* (M. Klöckener), *Altare* (V. Saxer), *Alypius* (E. Feldmann, Schindler and Wermelinger), *Ambitio* (A. Weische), *Ambrosius* (E. Dassmann), *Amen* (Klöckener), *Amicitia* (I. Hadot), *Amor* (D. Dideberg), *Amphitheatrum* (Weismann), *Angelus* (Madec), *Anima, animus* (first parts; O'Daly).

Fasc. 3: *Anima, animus* (cont.; O'Daly), *Anima et eius origine* (*De* -) (Zumkeller), *Animae quantitate* (*De* -) (K.-H. Lütcke), *Animal* (M. Baltes and D. Lau), *Annus*

(D. Pingree), *Antichristus* (Geerlings), *Antonius Fussalensis episcopus* (Munier), *Antonius Aegyptius monachus* (K.S. Frank), *Apis* (D. Lau), *Apocrypha* (Wermelinger), *Apollinaristae* (Studer), *Apostolus* (*apostolatus*) (Feldmann), *Apparitio* (Studer), *Appellatio* (Munier), *Appetitus* (O'Daly), *Apuleius* (Red.), *Aqua* (A.V. Nazzaro), *Aquila* (Lau), *Aranea* (idem), *Arbor* (A. Weische), *Archiuum* (W. Krieg), *Arelatum* (Munier and Lancel), *Aristoteles* (Stead), *Arithmetica* (*De* -) (O'Daly), *Armarium* (Krieg), *Arriani*, *Arrius* (M.G. Mara), *Arripui*, *aperui et legi* (Mayer), *Ars* (Lütcke), *Ascensio*, *ascensus* (Madec), *Ascensio Christi* (Geerlings), *Asinus* (first part; Lau).

Fasc. 4: *Asinus* (cont.; Lau), *Astrologia*, *astronomia* (Pingree), *Asylum* (J. Gaudemet), *Auaritia* (Schindler), *Auctoritas* (Lütcke), *Audientia episcopalis* (Munier), *Auditus* (U. Wienbruch), *Augustinus* (*uita*) (Bonner), *Aurelius episcopus* (La Bonnardière), *Babylon*(*ia*) (E. Lamirande), *Balneum*, *balneae* (Zumkeller), *Baptismo* (*De* -) (Schindler), *Baptismus* (V. Grossi), *Baptismus paruulorum* (Bonner), *Baptisterium* (J.-P. Caillet), *Barbarus* (C. Blönnigen), *Basilica* (Caillet), *Basilius* (G.J.M. Bartelink), *Bauto* (Madec), *Beata uita* (*De* -) (J. Doignon), *Beatitudo* (H. de Noronha Galvão), *Bellum* (first part; M.-F. Berrouard).

From this survey it appears first of all that in several cases the well-known specialists have written about specific subjects, e.g. Congar on "Abel", Dassmann on "Ambrose", Decret on Manichaeism, Doignon on *De beata uita* (in 1986 his new edition appeared in BA 4,1), Grossi on baptism, Munier on councils and bishops, Raveaux on *Contra adu. legis et proph.*, Stead on "Accidens" and "Aristoteles", Weismann on "Agon" and "Amphitheatrum". But it is also clear that the leading generalists are involved, those who can make contributions in several fields and who indeed already made several of them: Bonner, O'Daly (esp. Augustine's philosophy of mind), Feldmann (Manichaeism and much more), La Bonnardière, Madec, Mayer, Schindler, Wermelinger, Zumkeller. As could be expected, it is among the editors in particular that the highly-regarded Augustine-specialists are to be found (although articles of two of them have not yet been included), but also a collaborator like the well-known Adolar Zumkeller has up till now given - I would say as an invaluable 'stand-by' - a very notable contribution.

Of course it is not possible to discuss each of the articles separately. In many cases they are valuable studies, which not only summarize already familiar material but develop new points of view as well. In every case the current state of research is expounded and the relevant literature has been summed up fully.

A few remarks only will be made now on some of the articles, especially on the more detailed ones. In the first place there is in Fasc.

1/2 the extensive article "Africa" written by Claude Lepelley (A. Présentation générale, 180-205) and Serge Lancel (B. Organisation ecclésiastique, 205-216; C. Archéologie paléochrétienne: Bibliographie, 217-219). This article is not only impressive because of its proportions and the fact that three maps have been included (of which one, designed by Lancel, is a large unpaged sheet placed between col. 216 and 217: "Provinces ecclésiastiques et évêchés africains au temps de saint Augustin", a map that in itself is very valuable and, for instance, shows clearly to what extent Donatism had spread over Africa in Augustine's time, even deep into present-day Libya). But the importance of this tripartite article lies also in the fact that it is followed by two separate bibliographies and, moreover, by a special bibliographical survey of the early Christian archaeology of Roman Africa. In several respects this article has thus a particular value, for it places Augustine's life and milieu in a wide context and also explains thoroughly the ecclesiastical organisation. But at the same time one wonders why—though for instance in connection with the "seniores" (214-215) or with the data on the archaeology there certainly was reason for it—there is no mention here of the Jewish element that was present in Africa and exerted its influence. In 1901 Monceaux was already speaking about this, and in our own time the significance of this Jewish element for the Christian Church has been discussed by such scholars as Blumenkranz, Frend, Quispel and Simon. As a matter of fact a similar omission is apparent—and all the more striking in view of its aim—in the also rather recent article "Africa II (literaturgeschichtlich)" in *RAC*, Suppl. Bd., 134-228 (J. Fontaine/ S. Lancel/ A. Mandouze/ H. Brakmann/ P. Langlois): on the one hand indeed one speaks of Punic, Roman, Hellenistic, Catholic-Christian, Donatist, and even Manichaean streams, but on the other hand one does not mention Jewish and—directly linked with them—Jewish-Christian elements. For the *AL* we hope that this important aspect, for instance s.v. "Iudaei" or "Scriptores iudaei", will be discussed in full.

Other articles in Fasc. 1/2 that are important as regards their length and quality are Mayer's on "Abraham", Bonner's on "Adam" (in connection with the preceding, we emphasize the sentence [col. 74]: "A. was apparently aware of the Jewish tradition of Lilith, the demonic wife of Ad. in paradise before the creation of Eve, but rejects it: <<nescit autem habere praeter scripturas legitimas et propheticas Iudaeos quasdam traditiones suas, quas non scriptas habent sed memoriter

tenent, et alter in alterum loquendo transfundit, quas deuterosin uocant, ubi etiam dicere audent et credere deum primo homini duas creasse mulieres, ex quibus texunt genealogias uere, sicut ait apostolus, infinitas, parientes infructuosissimas quaestiones >> [*c.adu. leg.* 2,2]), A.-M. La Bonnardière's on "Adulterium" (preceded by her very useful introduction to Augustine's *De adulterinis coniugiis*), O'Daly and Zumkeller's on "Affectus (passio, perturbatio)", Feldmann/Schindler/Wermelinger's on "Alypius", and Madec's on "Angelus". The article "Alypius" deserves special mention as a fine example of teamwork; in comparison with the corresponding article by A. Mandouze c.s. in *PAC*, an important advantage of this contribution is that considerable information from the recently-discovered letters (ed. J. Divjak) concerning Augustine's friend and colleague has been arranged conveniently and convincingly by Wermelinger (256-265: "Alypius und Augustin zwischen 412 und 430"). E. Dassmann's article on Ambrose is also splendid, though it is with 12,5 col. (followed by 3,5 col. bibliography) much shorter than the all-enfolding and profound article on Abraham (total 23 col.!) or the eminent exposition on Adam (24 col.).

I have very great respect for the quality of the contributions, but there is room for some critical remarks. The article by Y. Congar ("Abel", 2-4) is rather essayistic, pleasant to read but somewhat out of place in this context. It is not sure that *en. Ps.* 39 dates exactly from 413 and concerning other dates (e.g. of *en. Ps.* 118) one can also have doubts. Furthermore, in regard to the partial quotation from *en. Ps.* 39, 13 the remark "c'est un très grand texte" is unclear: does this refer only to the length of the text or also to its contents? A remark such as "Le *s.* 341,11, à notre connaissance le seul qui parle d'Ab." no longer fits in the context of this lexicon project: all texts are available and rather easy to consult.—In the bibliography following the article "Abeloim" the initials of Walch should be changed to C.W.F. More important of course is the critical remark that the inclusion of M. Simon's study "Le Judaïsme berbère dans l'Afrique chrétienne" (1946), now in M. Simon's *Recherches d'Histoire Judéo-Chrétienne*, Paris-La Haye 1962, 30-87, would have been an enrichment. The statement that these remarkable heretics *returned* to the Catholic Church is questionable; Augustine only says: "Qui omnes modo correcti et Catholici *facti sunt*" (*haer.* 87, CCL 46,339). They appear to have been a Jewish (or at any rate: Judaizing) sect in which curiously the obligation to marry is combined with sexual abstinence, and at the same time they reveal gnostic tendencies. Shortly before 428 ("modo"!) these 'Abeloim' are merged into the Catholic Christian Church. The suggestion that Augustine prefers to mention them as 'Abeloim' is also debatable: the *epilogus* of *haer.* (CCL 46,343) (not referred to here) only gives (without any variant in the manuscript tradition) the name "Abeloitae" and this also takes place in the beginning at the enumeration of the capitula (*ibid.* 285), and the

so-called Praedestinatus speaks in the same way (I,87). Therefore an article under the title "Abeloitae" would have been preferable—the *AL* proceeds from Augustine's (most frequent) use of words (p. XIII)—though of course the unique statement "Abeloim uocabantur Punica declinatione nominis" remains highly interesting.—A sentence like "Les communautés manichéennes utilisaient sans doute les mêmes <codices> que les catholiques, et qui formaient la <Vetus latina> africaine" (57 n. 15) deserves at least some nuance; cf. e.g. G. Quispel, "Mani et la tradition évangélique des judéo-chrétiens", in: *Judéo-christianisme. Recherches historiques et théologiques offertes en hommage au Cardinal Jean Daniélou*, Paris 1972, 143-150; *id.*, "Saint Augustin et l'Évangile selon Thomas", in: *Mélanges d'histoire des religions offerts à Henri-Charles Puech*, Paris 1974, 375-378.—In the bibliography to "Adimantus" (col. 95) one must add to Alfaric, *Écritures*, the date 1919 and instead of *Psalmbook* one should read *Psalm-Book*.—Also the bibliography following the article "Aegyptus" (col. 139) contains some inaccuracies: title and page numbers of a well-known article by F.J. Dölger should be as follows: "Der Durch*z*ug durch das *R*ote Meer als Sinnbild der christlichen Taufe", AuC 2 (1930) *63-69*. In the article itself one should change 'Sybilline' into 'Sibylline' (col. 138).—In the article "Aetas", with reference to *ciu.* 11,1, the present time is mentioned as the time of the "processus (excursus)" of the two cities (col. 157, Tabel 4), but the first term raises questions. Augustine never used the word 'processus' in this context, but always spoke about the 'procursus' (e.g. *ciu.* 1,35; 10,32; 15,1; 16,12.35.43; 17,1.4.14; 18,1.2) or the 'excursus' (e.g. *ciu.* 11,1; 15,1.9), and that he actually preferred this last word he says in *ep. ad Firmum* 1: "...procursum siue dicere maluimus excursum..." (cf. also *retr.* 2,43: "... excursum siue procursum..."). In the bibliography to this article, which is indeed written very clearly and contains useful tables, mention could have been made—in accordance with most other bibliographies—of the fact that a reprint of Ladner's *Idea of Reform* has appeared (New York ²1967) and also of Scholz's *Glaube und Unglaube...* (Leipzig ²1967). A troublesome typographical error can be suspected in col. 156: "verfällt" should be "zerfällt".—That Augustine characterizes the 'agon bonus' also as an 'agon martyris', as the article on *De agone christiano* with reference to *s.* 315,10 posits (col. 221), is going too far, and one does not find this identification anywhere else. At the end of the sermon "in solemnitate Stephani martyris" Augustine deals with the spiritual struggle against the *ira* and then he concludes: "Deus adsit certaminibus uestris, ut prosit uobis quod tanti martyris agonem spectastis; ut quomodo uincentem uidistis et uincenti fauistis, sic et uos in corde uestro uincatis". At the most one can say that he compares the two 'agones' and that by doing so he sets up the 'agon martyris' as an example. Somewhat further it is preferable to change "Trilogie" into "Triade" (or eventually "Trias", col. 224; the curious wording of Bourgignon/Wenner in *DSp* 2,1138 has been imitated too readily) and in the bibliography (col. 227) one should read "Agostino" instead of "Agostinho".—Finally, in regard to the article "Allegoria" it can be noted that a thematic study would be welcome on the eventual importance of the Manichaeans to Augustine's understanding of allegory. Several years ago already it was pointed out that the Manichaeans used the method of allegory (e.g. by Alfaric; cf. also the more recent observations by Böhlig, Feldmann, and others), but what effect can this have had on Augustine's exegesis?

Concerning Fasc. 3 we can be more succint. It starts with the continuation of the important and well-considered article by Gerard O'Daly—particularly well-known for his *Augustine's Philosophy of Mind*, London 1987—on "anima, animus". O'Daly was a fulltime member of the editorial office from 1981-1984, and for this fascicle he has also written on "Appetitus" and "*Arithmetica* (*De-*)". Zumkeller writes on Augustine's *De anima et eius origine*, a work he already dealt with in the series *Sankt Augustinus. Der Lehrer der Gnade* (1977). Karl-Heinrich Lütcke, well-known for his translation of *De animae quantitate* in the series *Bibliothek der Alten Welt* (1973), here introduces this work in an expert way. The article by Matthias Baltes and Dieter Lau on "Animal" is also both extensive and profound. While Baltes discusses the more general aspects (e.g. the relation between man and animal), Lau gives a detailed exposition on Augustine's knowledge of the world of animals, their classification and names, the animal world as a part of creation, the distinguishing marks of animals, the value of zoology for Christians, and the role of animals in (biblical) imagery. As an appendix—I assume it was also compiled by Lau—a list is given of over a hundred animal names found in Augustine's writings. From this article we understand that the church father had a good eye for the beauty of the world of animals (e.g. col. 362 and n. 62), but also that he combined his own experience with fable 'knowledge'. It would be interesting to know just how much influence his attitude and valuations have had on later generations. An important goal of zoology is to be useful in the exegesis of the Holy Scriptures. That it is for this reason necessary to look at this side of Augustine's work becomes apparent also from Lau's four other contributions in this and the first part of the following fascicle of the *AL*: "Apis" (col. 383-385), "Aquila" (429-431), "Aranea" (432-433) and "Asinus" (479-482).

From the article "Apocrypha" it becomes quite clear that Augustine was well-acquainted with these writings. His past as a Manichaean is undoubtedly important in this regard (cf. col. 390). I suppose that any knowledge he may have had of e.g. the *Pastor Hermae* or the *Didache/Doctrina apostolorum* will be discussed in another context (s.v. "Canon scripturarum" or "Scriptores graeci/latini"?). The contribution s.v. "Apollinaristae" gives a brief but clear and authoritative introduction to this part of the history of dogma. It concludes that Western tradition has been decisively influenced by Augustine's polemics againt the Apollinarists. The article "Apostolus

(apostolatus)" is undoubtedly very thorough and here also the anti-Manichaean component receives due attention. The same is true of the article "Arbor": because of his anti-Manichaean point of view, Augustine is—unlike many earlier authors—very reticent about identifying Christ's cross with a tree (col. 434). That there are indeed also positive Manichaean influences can be seen likewise in a surprising way from this article by Alfons Weische (col. 437; cf. 439). As might be expected "Apparitio" is treated by B. Studer, well-known among other things for his *Zur Theophanie-Exegese Augustins...*, Roma 1971. From the rich contents of the other contributions I mention only the concluding remark of Lütcke's article "Ars": "Das Urteil, das in A. ein wirksames Beispiel für eine technikfeindliche Tendenz in der Kulturgeschichte sieht, ist (...) kritisch zu befragen" (col. 463).

One gains the impression that more time was available for a profound preparation and correction of this fascicle than was probably the case for those which appeared in the commemorative year. In any case the number of critical remarks and questions can be kept to a minimum:

The phrase "Anordnungen *Jahwes*" (col. 367 of the article "Animal") does not match Augustine's vocabulary and, moreover, seems to be generally incorrect. More important of course are the questions raised by this contribution and the enumeration of animal names following it: why has no article "Agnus" been included or, for instance, the lemma "Aspis"? As could be expected, the word *agnus* is often used by a Christian author like Augustine, and he indeed says much about it ("Agnus" as "figura Christi" etc.). But Augustine also speaks at length and in a remarkable way about the *aspis* (e.g. *en. Ps.* 57, 7-9; *s.* 316,2) and, for instance, about the *basiliscus* (e.g. *c. ep. Parm.* 2,7; *en. Ps.* 90,9). Those who have at their disposal the "List of Titles and Terms", which enumerates the planned articles, can also note the absence of a future article on, for example, "Perdix". Especially in *c. Faust.* 13 Augustine deals at length with this remarkable bird, which was for him a representation of the heretics.—The article "Annus" is rather compact and abstract, and there is no separate treatment of *annus* as indicating one's age.—In col. 389 one has again to change "Sybillinen" into "Sibyllinen"; in col. 393 one should read "Theopaschitismus" instead of "Theopaschismus".—In the bibliography to "Apostolus (apostolatus)" mention could have been made of some relevant studies by G.F.D. Locher, especially "Johannes, Paulus en Petrus bij Augustinus. De apostelen afzonderlijk", *NedThT* 31 (1976) 8-25.

In Fasc. 4, first and foremost the substantial article "Augustinus (uita)" (col. 519-550) draws the attention. The honour of writing this article was given to Gerald Bonner, and one is impressed by the way in which he accomplished this task. In the 30 columns allotted to this lemma he gives not only a survey of Augustine's life (par. 1-12), but also

a separate treatment of "Augustine as a monastic bishop" (par. 13), "Augustine and Donatism" (14), "*The City of God*" (15), "Augustine and Pelagianism" (16), "Augustine and Arianism and other heresies" (17), and Augustine's "Last years" (18). It is a very clear and reliable introduction to Augustine, succinctly expressed. Notable is Bonner's remark (col. 520) that we have actually made little progress since the great life by L.S. Le Nain de Tillemont (Latin version in PL 32, 65-578), although, of course, modern historical techniques and newly identified letters and sermons have made a new approach possible. In this context one can also mention discoveries in the field of Manichaean studies.

Conspicuous in this issue are also the contributions on baptism. First there is the article by Alfred Schindler on *De baptismo*, in which he remarks: "Man kann das Werk als A.s gründlichste Widerlegung des Donatismus bezeichnen". Profound and very clear is also the article "Baptismus" by Vittorini Grossi, a specialist on Augustine's theology and liturgy of baptism. Bonner gives his contribution on "Baptismus paruulorum" in which, of course, the Pelagian view has been handled as well as the question of the fate of unbaptized infants. Jean-Pierre Caillet wrote the article "Baptisterium".

Excellent indeed and written from a superior knowledge of the (new) sources, is the contribution "Aurelius episcopus" of Anne-Marie La Bonnardière. She remarks, for instance, that Bishop Aurelius "instaura le chant des Psaumes au moment de l'offertoire et de la communion" (col. 554).

Regarding this fascicle also, we have only a few critical remarks and questions. The initials of Warfield—in his day a famous Princeton professor—should read B.B., and the first part of his article "Augustine's Doctrine of Knowledge and Authority" can be found in *PThR* 5 (1907) 353-397 (col. 510).—In the article "Augustinus (uita)" one should read "than" instead of "that" (526), "Cassiciacum" instead of "Cassiciacan" (532), "has" instead of "was" (534), "an" instead of "and" (536), "through" instead of "though" (538). In regard to "the highly laudatory letter of Pelagius" which Augustine responded to "with a flowery reply" (544), reference could be made to the analysis by J. den Boeft, "Augustine's letter to Pelagius", in: J. den Boeft et J. van Oort (éd.), *Augustiniana Traiectina*..., Paris 1987, 73-84. Concerning the statement that the evidence for Augustine's homosexual relationships "is scanty in the extreme" (523), I have my doubts. We need to distinguish clearly between actually being a homophile (which Augustine was not) and intermittant homosexual practices.—In col. 589 it is necessary to supplement the quotation from *c. litt. Pet.* 3,9 <<... uos interrogaui ... *utrum* ... *credideritis* ... in patrem et filium et spiritum sanctum>>. In the same column one should read "accedit" instead of "accedat".

At the end of this introductory overview our conclusion can be brief. The *AL* will be one of the main works of our time in the field of patristic studies. With the help of c. 100 collaborators and of a most competent redactor in the person of Dr. Karl Heinz Chelius, a highly qualified editorial staff under the guidance of Cornelius Mayer is working on a project that will be an indispensable tool for many more scholars than the Augustinianists.

NOTES

[1] Cf. e.g. A. Zumkeller, *Manuskripte von Werken der Autoren des Augustiner-Eremitenordens in mitteleuropäischen Bibliotheken*, Würzburg 1966, 88-89.

[2] Cf. Ph. Sellier, "Le siècle de Saint Augustin. Introduction", *XVIIe siècle* 34 (1982) 99, with reference to a statement of Jean Dagens.

[3] Address: Augustinus-Institut der deutschen Augustiner, Würzburg, Steinbachtal 2^a.

[4] Insufficient is E. Nebreda's *Bibliographia Augustiniana*, Roma 1928; absolutely inadequate T.L. Miethe's *Augustinian Bibliography 1970-1980*, Westport, Conn. and London 1982.

[5] Very briefly it is stated in the first sentence of the Preface: "The Augustinus-Lexikon endeavours to give a comprehensive account of Augustine *the individual* [my italics], his milieu, and his thought". With regard to Augustine's accentuation of community and friendship, however, this is a rather infelicitous wording.

[6] Slight inaccuracies are present in the rendering of the titles of *Nederland(sch) Theologisch Tijdschrift* (XLIX), *Didaskalia. Revista da Faculdade de Theologia de Lisbõa* (LIX) and *Svensk Teologisk Kvartalskrift* [=SvTK] (LX).

Utrecht University, Faculty of Theology
3584 CS *Utrecht*, Heidelberglaan 2.

Vigiliae Christianae 45 (1991), 388-398, E. J. Brill, Leiden

ASTERIUS SOPHISTA ODER ASTERIUS IGNOTUS? EINE ANTWORT

VON

WOLFRAM KINZIG

In *Vigiliae Christianae* 45 (1991), pp. 194-203 ist Karl-Heinz Uthemann (im folgenden: U.) in einer langen Rezension mit meinem Buch *In Search of Asterius. Studies on the Authorship of the Homilies on the Psalms*, Göttingen 1990 (FKDG 47) scharf ins Gericht gegangen. Darin wird die erstmals von Marcel Richard und Eiliv Skard aufgestellte Behauptung, der Verfasser der von Richard 1956 herausgegebenen Psalmenhomilien[1] sei mit dem Sophisten Asterius (im folgenden: AS), einem Arianer der ersten Generation identisch, einer kritischen Prüfung unterzogen. Ich komme zu dem Schluß, daß der Autor der Psalmenhomilien tatsächlich Asterius heißt (im folgenden: Ast), daß er aber nicht mit dem Sophisten identisch ist, sondern sein *floruit* zwischen etwa 385 und 410 in Palästina oder eher Westsyrien (Antiochen) anzusetzen ist. Die Hypothese Richards (und Skards) könne man damit als widerlegt betrachten (vgl. p. 157). U. nennt dieses Fazit, dem mittlerweile im Druck bereits Christopher Stead, Adolf Martin Ritter und Henry Chadwick zugestimmt haben,[2] »vorschnell« (p. 203) und versucht, mir in großem Detail methodische Schwächen und inhaltliche Fehlurteile nachzuweisen.

Nun könnte die Angelegenheit auf sich beruhen bleiben, ginge es nicht um Texte, die für die Frühgeschichte des Arianismus reklamiert werden. Schon Richard glaubte, »diese Sammlung von Homilien [...] erlaube, der Geschichte der arianischen Häresie, wie wir sie kennen, ein völlig neues Kapitel hinzuzufügen,«[3] und Maurice Wiles und Robert C. Gregg sowie Richard P. C. Hanson haben versucht, dieses Kapitel zu schreiben.[4] Denn wäre die Identifikation des Autors richtig, so stünde uns damit die einzige direkt überlieferte Quelle für den frühen Arianismus zur Verfügung.

U. möchte nun an der Identifikation durch Richard festhalten, ohne indessen grundlegend neue Argumente dafür vorzubringen. Es geht also im wesentlichen darum, ob sein Resümee, meine Widerlegung der These Richards sei mißglückt, zutrifft. Leider ist die Problematik so komplex,

daß es hier mit allgemeinen Überlegungen nicht getan ist, sondern man, wie dies U. ja auch tut, in die Details gehen muß. Ich gehe daher im folgenden seine Kritikpunkte einzeln durch.[5]

1. ad pp. 194f (zu Hom. 17,9): Ich hatte auf pp. 153f betont, daß es in vorliegendem Paragraphen keineswegs darum geht, daß »hier Christus als der göttliche Erlöser gesehen [wird], der auf Grund seiner eigenen freien Wahl 'dem Willen des Vaters gehorsam' blieb und so 'unser Herr' ist« (U., pp. 194f in Anschluß an Richard). Der Gegenstand der προαίρεσις Christi ist nicht die Unterordnung des Willens unter den Vater, sondern sind wir, insofern wir nach Joh 20,22 den Heiligen Geist empfangen haben.[5a] Von freiwilligem Gehorsam Christi gegenüber dem Willen des Vaters ist hier und auch an den anderen Stellen, wo das Wort προαίρεσις in den Psalmenhomilien erscheint, nicht die Rede (vgl. mein Buch p. 154, Anm. 338). Insofern sind U.s Anführungszeichen irreführend. Ich sehe auch nach dem, was U. p. 201 zur vorliegenden Stelle sagt, keinen Anlaß, meine Interpretation zu ändern.

2. ad p. 195 (Kleindruck: »unter Absehen von allen im kritischen Apparat genannten Varianten«): Dies ist nachweislich falsch. Denn ich führe auf p. 183 aus, daß ich in allen Fällen, in denen Richards Text vom Koine-Text, dem sogenannten »lukianischen Text« (L), abweicht (87 Fälle), den Apparat Richards konsultiert habe. Wo Richards Text L folgt, habe ich darauf aus praktischen Gründen verzichtet, ganz einfach aufgrund der schieren Fülle von Psalm-Zitaten in den Homilien (im Ganzen 1259!) und weil ich glaubte, mich auf Richards textkritische Kompetenz verlassen zu können (was U. ja sonst auch tut). Es darf wohl außer Zweifel stehen, daß Richard in allen diesen Fällen die *lectiones difficiliores*, d. h. die von L (= Koine-Text!) abweichenden Lesarten, sorgfältig bedacht hat.

3. ad pp. 195f (zum Problem der »stilometrischen Analyse«): Die Wahl meiner Paralleltexte war bestimmt durch die auf pp. 48f vorgetragenen Überlegungen.[6] »Amas«, »Lieb« und »Migne« wurden miteinbezogen, weil der Verdacht bestand, es könne sich um denselben Autor wie bei »Y« handeln. »Eus« und »Diod« waren Vergleichstexte, die deshalb herangezogen wurden, um Kontrollgrößen zu erhalten. Sie wurden gewählt, um selbst dann, wenn man die Genus- (und Zeit-)Unabhängigkeit der »function words« nicht anerkennt (und dies ist in der Tat diskussionswürdig, vgl. dazu meine Bemerkungen p. 51, Anm. 31!), ver-

läßliche Vergleichsmöglichkeiten zu haben. Hätte ich einen völlig anderen Text genommen (etwa die »Stromateis« des Clemens), so hätte ich mir von U. vorhalten lassen müssen, daß etwaige Unterschiede im Ergebnis ja doch ohne Zweifel auf die unterschiedliche Gattung zurückzuführen seien! Wenn U. mir p. 197 vorwirft, ich hätte zum Vergleich »peinlich«erweise auch Migne-Texte herangezogen, so ist dem entgegenzuhalten, daß eine kritische Edition dieser Schriften den Rahmen der Arbeit bei weitem gesprengt hätte. Da ich mir der von U. angedeuteten Problematik aber durchaus bewußt war, habe ich im Falle des Textes »Migne« absichtlich keine Konsequenzen für die Frage der Autorschaft gezogen (vgl. p. 58!). Ebenso habe ich mich bei den Kontrollgrößen ja keineswegs *ausschließlich* auf die Migne-Edition des Psalmenkommentars des Eusebius verlassen. »Diod« (nach der Ausgabe CChr.SG 6) hätte allein statistisch durchaus hingereicht!

Schließlich lassen sich die mathematischen Formeln, die ich zur statistischen Berechnung angewendet habe, leider nicht ohne weiteres »in Umgangssprache« (U., p. 196) ausdrücken. Ich darf angesichts der Fortschritte in der stilometrischen Forschung gewisse Grundkenntnisse voraussetzen, wie man sie etwa bei Kenny leicht nachlesen kann (vgl. die Hinweise p. 50). Die Bemerkungen p. 196: »M. a. W.: was das Programm leistet« bis »erläutert und begründet wird« halte ich nun meinerseits für »peinlich«, da es sich dabei um elementare statistische Berechnungen handelt, die mit der »Leistung« des Oxford Concordance Program (das ein reines Konkordanzprogramm ist und lediglich die Ausgangsdaten lieferte, vgl. p. 50!)) nichts zu tun haben. Überdies habe ich durchweg auf weiterführende Literatur verwiesen. Es ist bedauerlich, daß U. es versäumt hat, wenigstens andeutungsweise meine Ergebnisse zu diskutieren, die einer der Mathematiker, die mich bei der Anfertigung dieses Kapitels beraten haben, als traumhaft bezeichnete.

4. ad pp. 197 (zum Problem Homilien oder Kommentar): Wieso es »nicht bewiesen, ja verkehrt« ist, wenn ich behaupte, daß es sich bei den angeblichen Kommentaren um Homilien handelt, ist mir angesichts der »Wolke« von Forschungszeugen, die ich p. 115, Anm. 203 angebe, völlig unklar. Ferner benutzt Richard die Ausdrücke »Homilie« und »Kommentar« offensichtlich weitgehend *promiscue* (vgl. etwa Edition, pp. IIIff). Dies tut er deshalb, weil Hieronymus, einer der Kronzeugen Richards, in *vir. inl.* 94 eben von Kommentaren spricht, nicht von Homilien (vgl. ebenda p. III), Richard selbst sich aber durchaus darüber

im klaren war, daß es sich hier um Predigten handelte. Es ist daher wesentlich, die Zuverlässigkeit des Hieronymus als Zeugen für die Identifikation des Autors im allgemeinen zu untersuchen, sowie insbesondere die Frage, ob Hieronymus die Ausdrücke auch *promiscue* gebraucht oder nicht. Meine Ausführungen auf pp. 115-122 (die nach U. »nichts abwerfen«) dienten erstens dazu zu zeigen, daß der Sprachgebrauch des Hieronymus grundsätzlich durchaus präzise ist (er terminologisch also sauber zwischen *commentarii/explanatio* und *tractatus/homilia* unterscheidet). Zweitens sollten sie deutlich machen, daß man, wenn man dies angesichts des apologetischen Charakters von *de viris inlustribus* nicht durchweg anerkennen will, die Zuverlässigkeit von Hieronymus als Zeuge in der Autorfrage überhaupt ins Zwielicht gerät (eben weil er in dem Werk auch Schriften erfindet). So oder so wird kein Schuh draus.

5. ad pp. 197-199 (zum Problem von 26,1-3): Zunächst: U. geht auf meine auf pp. 64f vorgetragenen strukturellen Überlegungen nicht näher ein. Die textkritischen Fragen in 26,3 (p. 206,22 bzw. 25) spielen für das vorliegende Problem keine Rolle. Mit Keydell[7] und Richard in den *Corrigenda* in Skards Index, p. 13 (die U. offenbar nicht eingesehen hat), ist der Satz ab Τίς (Z. 22) bis σπίλῳ (Z. 28) ohne Zweifel als *ein einziger* Satz zu lesen. Strittig ist allerdings, ob es sich dabei um einen Relativsatz handelt (so Keydell) oder einen deliberativen Fragesatz (wie Richard in den *Corrigenda* anzunehmen scheint). Im vorliegenden Zusammenhang ergäbe allerdings eine weitere Frage wenig Sinn, da man eher eine Antwort auf die bereits im Psalmzitat gestellte Frage erwartet, zumal Ast dies ja ausdrücklich angekündigt hatte (... δίδαξον αὐτοὺς δι' ἐμοῦ, δέσποτα, ὁποῖος εἶναι ὀφείλει ὁ σὸς πάροικος ... Z. 19f). Demnach scheint es sinnvoller, mit Keydell alle durch τίς eingeleiteten Sätze bis 207,22 als Relativsätze anzusehen.[8] In jedem Fall erübrigt sich die Konjektur ὁ in Z. 22. Ich übersetze also p. 206,21-28 (Richard, korrigiert) folgendermaßen:

»'*Herr, wer wird in deinem Zelt wohnen?*' [Ps 14,1b]. Der, der, nachdem er zu deiner schönen Herde gezählt wurde und das Siegel des heiligen Geistes empfing und mit dem leuchtenden Blut des Christus rot gefärbt wurde, das leuchtende Siegel nicht mit irgendwelchem flüssigem Pech, neben den anderen Häresien (insbesondere) mit dem Glauben des Arius und des Eunomius, der durch (ihre) Taufe flüssig geworden ist, mit flüssigem Klebstoff oder mit wasserfestem Schmutz befleckt hat.«

Ich fahre mit der Übersetzung fort (p. 206,28-207,9):

»Auch jene hatten einst wie Schafe weiße Wolle und ein leuchtendes Siegel. Aber sie hielten die Wolle so lange weiß, wie sie die Taufe der Kirche hatten, und ihr Siegel trug so lange die leuchtende (Farbe) des Blutes Christi, wie sie die Anordnung hinsichtlich der Taufe versiegelt hielten. Seitdem sie aber die drei Immersionen zu einer zusammengezogen haben, sind sie zu Schmarotzern der drei verschiedenen Wesen geworden. Denn wie jene die Lehre von den verschiedenen Wesen (vertraten), so auch diese (noch dazu) die Taufe (sc. von den verschiedenen Wesen)! Damit also auch deine neuen Gäste, die Neuerleuchteten, wie Schafe die wilden Tiere in Schafsgestalt fliehen, die '*in der Kleidung von Schafen*' [Mt 7,15] die Schafe in die Irre führen, lehre, Herr, deine Gäste die Gesetze!«

Wie immer man auch Hom. 26,3 (p. 207,5f ὡς γὰρ ἐκείνοις τὸ δόγμα ἑτεροούσιον, καὶ τούτοις τὸ βάπτισμα) verstehen mag — auf die Neugetauften, wie U. annimmt, kann sich ἐκεῖνοι unmöglich beziehen, da der Text doch gerade vor dem ἑτεροούσιον warnt! Eher würde ich darin einen Bezug auf die frühen Nachfolger des Arius sehen, die »nur« an dem Dogma der Heteroousie festhielten (p. 206,29-207,3), während die Eunomianer (τούτοις) nunmehr sogar die *Taufe* in diesem Sinne verstehen wollen (p. 206,4f) und sich damit endgültig aus der Kirche Christi abgespalten haben. Man könnte auch fragen, ob sich aus pp. 206,25-28 (Richard) nicht doch eine Wiedertaufe der Orthodoxen durch die Eunomianer erschließen läßt. (In diesem Sinne wären meine Ausführungen pp. 144f möglicherweise zu präzisieren.) Für die Annahme einer Interpolation sehe ich indessen weder grammatikalische, noch stilistische, noch inhaltliche Anzeichen.

6. ad p. 199 (zu Hom. 27,8 [p. 218,19]): Gleiches gilt für die zweite »Interpolation« U's. Schon die typisch asterianische Assonanz ἀμβλυωπῶν — βλέπων widerrät der Annahme einer nachträglichen Einfügung von καὶ τὸ ἑτεροούσιον βλέπων. Vielmehr ist ἑτεροούσιον (wie schon in meinem Buch auf p. 142 betont) im Sinne von 26,3 zu verstehen: Der Autor stellt, von Ps 14,2a ausgehend, die Frage nach den Qualitäten, die der haben muß, der vor den Herrn hintreten möchte, und nennt zunächst ethische Forderungen (keine Sünde, keine Unzucht, keinen Meineid, Wohltätigkeit) sowie dann offenbar die Forderung nach dem Gehorsam gegenüber der kirchlichen Disziplin (dem ἐκκλησίας δρόμος) und Ablehnung des (nicht nur häretischen, sondern auch schismatischen, vgl. 26,3) ἑτεροούσιον.

7. ad p. 199 (Kleindruck Anfang): Daß pp. 69-91 »nichts Nennenswertes« beitragen, »das über M. Richard hinausführen oder dessen Ausführungen in Frage stellen könnte«, kann man nur dann behaupten, wenn man Richards Beweisgang nicht sorgfältig nachvollzogen oder das fragliche Kapitel nicht gründlich genug gelesen hat. Richard identifizierte den Ast mit AS nämlich a) aufgrund des Hieronymus-Zeugnisses (vgl. dazu oben) sowie b) aufgrund des Katenenlemmas Ἀστερίου Ἀρειανοῦ. Die Ausführungen pp. 69-91 weisen nun nach, daß mit hoher Wahrscheinlichkeit der Zusatz Ἀρειανοῦ das Resultat eines *sekundären* Identifikationsversuches (evtl. anhand der griechischen Übersetzung von *de viris inlustribus* des Hieronymus) ist (vgl. besonders pp. 86-88)! Die Katenenlemmata scheiden so als Mittel zur Bestimmung der Autorschaft völlig aus. Damit ist aber auch der zweite Hauptpfeiler der Hypothese Richards zusammengebrochen.

8. ad p. 199 (Kleindruck 2. Hälfte): Ich halte an meinem Kommentar zu Hom. 21,21 fest. Frg. 11f (AS) bezieht sich auf die Unterscheidung zwischen dem einen Gott Logos (der mit Christus nicht identisch ist!) und der einen τῆς σοφίας οὐσία τε καὶ φύσις einerseits sowie den vielen λογικά und σοφὰ καὶ καλά andererseits (die natürlich den Christus Logos als geschaffenes Wesen einschließen!; vgl. dazu meinen Kommentar p. 129; dort auch der angeblich fehlende Bezug auf Wiles und Gregg; vgl. Anm. 248). So schreibt Bardy (auf den ich dort ebenfalls verweise [lies aber statt pp. 204f.: 264f.]) ja auch ausdrücklich und ganz richtig: »Mais la Sagesse divine dont il parle ici [sc. in frgg. 11f] n'est pas Sagesse personnelle; c'est toujours la Sagesse immanente et incréée. Il est vrai que le Fils est verbe et sagesse à un degré suréminent lorsqu'on le compare aux autres créatures; sur ce point comme sur les autres, il n'y a pourtant pas de différence essentielle entre lui et elles«.[9] In 21,21 hingegen werden — im Anschluß an eine breite Auslegungstradition (vgl. die Belege p. 135, Anm. 264)! — Christus, μία δικαιοσύνη und ἀλήθεια ἐνυπόστατος gerade einander zugeordnet und so von den vielen χριστοί und ἀλήθειαι abgegrenzt! Aus *diesem* Grunde spricht Ast hier gerade *nicht* von Christus als einer dem Vater untergeordneten Hypostase (auch wenn er die Möglichkeit nicht explizit ausschließt; er hatte an dieser Frage eben kein Interesse).

Dies scheint auch U. klar zu sein, denn er stellt, den Paragraphen abschließend, fest: »Wie bekannt, geht Asterius nirgends auf diese Frage ein«. Er fährt dann aber fort: »Es müsste also trotz des *silentium*

ein Argument geliefert werden, dass der Autor irgendwo implizit voraussetzt oder 'mitsagt', dass er den (arianischen) Subordinatianismus ablehnt.« Dies halte ich aber aus methodischen Gründen für fragwürdig. Nachdem ich nämlich in den vorangegangenen Kapiteln bereits gezeigt hatte, daß sich Richards Identifikation von der Textüberlieferung her nicht zwingend ergibt, besteht hinsichtlich der Identifikation gewissermaßen ein *non liquet*. In dieser Situation muß ich aber nicht Richards Identifikation *widerlegen*, sondern er muß sie mit theologischen Argumenten *beweisen*. Nicht ich muß also darlegen, daß Ast den Subordinatianismus *ablehnt* (was ich im übrigen in fraglichem Kapitel m. E. mit hinreichender Deutlichkeit tue), sondern die Verteidiger der Hypothese Richards müssen zeigen, daß er ihn *vertritt*. Dazu läßt sich aber (und nur dies sollten meine Ausführungen zeigen) Hom. 21,21 nicht heranziehen.

9. ad pp. 199f (zu Hom. 1,4f): Wieso es sich in Hom. 1,4 (λόγος [sc. Christus] ὡς ἀχώριστος τοῦ πατρός) »nicht um jenen ontologischen Chorismos« handeln kann, »der bei Athanasius das Verhältnis von Gott und Kreatur kennzeichnet«, sehe ich nicht. Überdies gelten auch hier die oben unter 8. angeführten methodologischen Bedenken.

10. ad p. 200: Zur Frage der Zuverlässigkeit des cod. Mosquensis Bibl. Synod. 234 habe ich mich (p. 141) ausdrücklich und mit Bedacht auf Richards eigene Einschätzung bezogen, die, so meine ich, doch tatsächlich die Schlußfolgerung, der Kodex sei mindestens in der Überlieferung dieser Homilie nicht sehr zuverlässig, erlaubt. Zudem: Selbst wenn man die Lesart συνεργός ἐστιν vorziehen sollte (wozu ich bislang keinen Anlaß sehe), ergibt sich immer noch das Problem, daß Ast auch in 18,14 (p. 132,10f) den Sohn als πατρὸς ὁμοούσιος bezeichnet wird, wobei sich U. hier nicht auf abweichende Lesarten berufen kann (der Text ist in fünf Handschriften überliefert, die mindestens zwei unterschiedlichen Familien entstammen!)

11. ad p. 201 (zu Joh. 1,18: ὁ μονογενὴς θεός): U. stimmt mir darin zu, daß diese Lesart an sich nicht beweise, »dass ein Text arianischer Provenienz« sei. Er fährt fort: »Entscheidend ist auch für diese Frage der Kontext: Wird die Formel für den Logos gewissermassen als Titel und eindeutig im Gegensatz zu ὁ θεός, dem absolut transzendenten Vater, gebraucht, dann kann dies der Darstellung einer subordinatianischen, darum auch einer arianischen Christologie dienen.« Das mag wohl rich-

tig sein: Doch gelten auch hier wieder die oben unter 8. vorgebrachten methodologischen Vorbehalte. Überdies: trifft dies auf Ast zu? Wird die Formel bei ihm tatsächlich als Titel und im Gegensatz zu ὁ θεός gebraucht? Werfen wir einen Blick auf die einschlägigen Stellen: In 10,11 (in einer Homilie, die Richard übrigens nicht als »echt«, d.h. asterianisch ansah! vgl. meine Zusammenfassung pp. 29-31) heißt es:

»'*Morgens wirst du meine Stimme erhören*' [Ps 5,4a]. Propheten sprachen über die Erbin Kirche: '*Gott wird ihr gegen Morgen zu Hilfe kommen*' [Ps 45,6b v.l.], der eingeborene Gott, der frühmorgens von den Toten auferstanden ist«.

Oben hatte U. meinen Nachweis, Ast spreche ganz unarianisch davon, daß der Logos vom Vater nicht getrennt sei, damit abgewiesen, daß Ast eben nicht »ontologisch, 'essentialistisch'« denke wie Athanasius. Hier will er nun aber Ast ebenfalls »essentialistisch« lesen, um aus dem Text einen Subordinatianismus herauszupressen. Dies ist aber nun *hier* in der Tat nicht möglich: Denn die Formel ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός steht ja keineswegs in »essentialistischem« Gegensatz zum Titel ὁ θεός als Gottesbezeichnung, sondern die Anspielung auf Joh 1,18 ist gefordert, um das Zitat Ps 45,6b *exegetisch* auswerten und auf Christus beziehen zu können. Grundsätzlicher klingt 18,14:

»'*Über die Geheimnisse des Sohnes*' [Ps 9,1]. Und wer ist der Sohn? Der eingeborene Gott, der Logos, der Sohn gleichen Wesens mit dem Vater, der Schöpfer des Alls. Der Herr selbst ist (dafür) Zeuge: '*Er sprach zu mir: Du bist mein Sohn*' [Ps 2,7]. Zeuge ist auch der Vater: '*Du bist mein geliebter Sohn*' [Mt 1,11 = Lk 3,22]. Wenn aber Vater und Sohn (dies) bezeugen, ist alles weitere Zeugnis überflüssig.«

Hier steht U.s Argumentation aber nun das (textkritisch unanfechtbare) ὁμοούσιος im Wege, das er dann mit Richard grundlos einklammern müßte (vgl. auch oben 10.). Im übrigen liegt bei Ast der Akzent natürlich nicht auf μονογενής, sondern auf θεός, wie sich an zahlreichen Stellen im Corpus zeigen ließe: Die *Gottheit* Christi garantiert die Erlösung; an einer Subordination des Logos (ein bei Ast im übrigen recht seltener Titel) unter den Vater hat er gerade *kein* Interesse (wie U. ja auch selbst zugeben muß). Auch ist »die Behauptung, in XVI,8, S. 125,26 finde sich die Lesart ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός,« natürlich keineswegs »verkehrt«, sondern beruht auf einem Druckfehler (XVI,8 statt richtig: XVII,8) bei mir auf p. 153, Anm. 336. Hätte U. die bei mir vorsichtshalber immer mit angegebenen Seiten- und Zeilenzahlen nachgeschlagen, so hätte er auf p. 125,26 mit den Kodizes und der Korrektur bei Skard, Index, p. 12^{10} lesen können: Κύριε, μονογενῆ υἱέ.

12. ad p. 202 (zu Ps 109,3): Bei meiner Interpretation von frg. 23 im Sinne von frg. 24 (Zeugung des Logos πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων bewiesen aus Ps 109,3) auf p. 130 bin ich nahezu wörtlich Bardy gefolgt.[11] Auf eine ausgedehnte Diskussion der beiden Fragmente habe ich verzichtet, weil ich glaubte, auf die Arbeiten Bardys und Rondeaus[12] verweisen zu können. Im übrigen räumt U. im selben Absatz weiter unten ein, daß diese Interpretation richtig ist. Ich denke daher, daß ich nach allem, was darüber bereits publiziert wurde, auf p. 147 durchaus sagen kann: »It was shown above [sc. auf p. 130] that AS referred Ps 109:3 explicitly to the generation of the preexistent Christ (frg. 23)«.

Aus der Lesart ἐγέννησα in Ps 109,3, die AS nach Markell, dem wir diese Information verdanken, der Lesart ἐξεγέννησα vorgezogen haben soll und die sich auch bei Ast (18,15 [p. 132,25]) findet, läßt sich für die Autorschaftsfrage kein Kapital schlagen. Denn wie ein Blick in den Apparat von Rahlfs' *editio maior* der Psalmen zeigt, ist sie die Lesart des Koine-Textes (L, sog. »lukianische« Rezension) und findet sich ferner im Alexandrinus, bei Theodoret sowie offenbar im cod. 1219.[13] Es kann ferner kein Zweifel daran bestehen, daß Ps 109,3 in frg. 24 *ganz* auf die vorzeitliche Zeugung des Logos bezogen wird (wie übrigens U. ja auch selbst betont, wenn er sagt: »...aber die insinuierte Interpretation von πρὸ τοῦ ἑωσφόρου durch πρὸ αἰώνων lässt sich indirekt als Voraussetzung für die Argumentation in Fragment 24 aufweisen«), während Ast *nur* von der Jungfrauengeburt spricht. (Wenn U. für Ast feststellt, »das Verhältnis der zwei γεννήσεις — 'vor den Aionen' 'aus der Jungfrau' — zueinander«, werde »hier nicht reflektiert«, so ist diese Bemerkung gegenstandslos angesichts der Tatsache, daß auch AS ja gerade *nicht* von *zwei* γεννήσεις spricht.) Hier scheint mir tatsächlich ein *direkter Widerspruch* zwischen den Psalmenhomilien und den Fragmenten des AS zu bestehen, der sich durch Interpolationsverdacht nun leider nicht aus der Welt schaffen läßt.

Schließlich: Aus Hom. 21,12 kann man m. E. nur dann einen Subordinatianismus herauslesen, wenn dieser an anderer Stelle bewiesen wäre. Ast ist hier viel zu vage, um so weitgehende Überlegungen, wie sie U. anstellt, zu erlauben.

13. ad pp. 202 (Datierungsfragen): Der *terminus ante quem* ist in der Tat schwierig zu bestimmen. Ich habe aber p. 145 auch darauf hingewiesen, daß die Polemik gegen die Eunomianer in 26,3 eine Datierung vor dem letzten antieunomianischen Gesetz (438) nahelegt. Überdies müssen

die Eunomianer noch als eine massive Gefahr empfunden worden sein, was zu einem Datum um 410 als oberer Grenze führt. Im übrigen verweise ich auf p. 161 ausdrücklich auf die Problematik, die mit der Datierung aufgrund von *argumenta e silentio* verbunden ist, und betone abschließend: »None of these arguments is conclusive on its own [!]. Yet taken together they seem to me to make a strong case in favour of a date of composition of the *HomPs* [= Psalmenhomilien] between 385 and around 410« (p. 164). Wieso »die Gewohnheit, während einer Osteroktav (täglich) für die Neugetauften zu predigen«, »eher gegen die Datierung von K[inzig]« spricht, bleibt das Geheimnis des Rezensenten. Vgl. dazu meine Bemerkungen pp. 162-164.

Abschließend darf ich auf meine mittlerweile vorliegende Studie »Erbin Kirche« verweisen, in der die Datierung nicht nur weiter untermauert wird (vgl. v. a. p. 15, Anm. 22), sondern auch wörtliche Übereinstimmungen mit Johannes Chrysostomus nachgewiesen werden, die sich mit einer Autorschaft des Sophisten schlecht vertragen (vgl. pp. 69-73).[14] Ich bleibe also dabei: Die Hypothese Richards (und Skards) ist wissenschaftlich erledigt.

Peterhouse, *Cambridge* CB2 1RD

ANMERKUNGEN

[1] Asterii Sophistae commentariorum in psalmos quae supersunt accedunt aliquot homiliae anonymae, edidit Marcel Richard, Oslo 1956 (SO.S 16). Vgl. dazu den Index Asterianus, hg. von Eiliv Skard, Oslo 1962 (SO.S 17) mit den *Corrigenda et addenda* Richards (pp. 9-16).

[2] Christopher Stead in JThS 41 (1990), p. 670; Adolf Martin Ritter, Arius redivius? Ein Jahrzwölft Arianismusforschung, ThR 55 (1990), pp. 153-187, 169-171; Henry Chadwick, Heresy and Orthodoxy in the Early Church, Aldershot 1990 (Variorum Collected Studies), p. X. Auch Maurice Wiles hat bereits Zweifel an seiner ursprünglichen These geäußert; vgl. M. F. Wiles, The Theology of Eusebius of Emesa, in: StPatr XIX, 1989, pp. 267-280, 279: »... the painstaking work of Wolfram Kinzig has shown that the ascription of those homilies to Asterius the Sophist is less secure than Richard had suggested.« Zu früheren Zweifeln an der Richtigkeit der Hypothese von Richard und Skard schon vor meiner Arbeit vgl. mein Buch, p. 13.

[3] Marcel Richard, Une Ancienne Collection d'Homélies Grecques sur les Psaumes I-XV, SO 25 (1947), pp. 54-73, 73.

[4] Maurice F. Wiles/Robert C. Gregg, Asterius: A New Chapter in the History of Arianism?, in: Robert C. Gregg (Hg.), Arianism: Historical and Theological Reassessments, Philadelphia 1985 (Patristic Monograph Series 11), pp. 111-151; Richard P. C. Hanson, The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God. The Arian Controversy 318-381, Edinburgh 1988, bes. p. 41. Vgl. ferner mein Buch, pp. 27-37.

[5] Ich weise darauf hin, daß meine Numerierung der einzelnen Paragraphen im folgenden nicht mit der U.s übereinstimmt, da U. in einem Paragraphen häufig mehrere meiner Ausführungen beanstandet.

[5a] Zur Bezeichnung der Gläubigen (»wir«) als Apostel vgl. auch 16,7 (p. 119,18f).

[6] Zu den Abkürzungen im folgenden vgl. mein Buch, pp. 49f.

[7] Vgl. Rudolf Keydell, Gn. 30 (1958), pp. 101-105, 104.

[8] Zu τίς als Relativpronomen gerade in der Koine vgl. Eduard Schwyzer/Albert Debrunner, Griechische Grammatik II, 4. Aufl., München 1975 (HAW II/1,2), p. 644. Zum Konjunktiv vgl. ibid., p. 312.

[9] Gustave Bardy, Astérius le Sophiste, RHE 22 (1926), pp. 221-272, 265.

[10] Vgl. schon Apparat und Keydell, op. cit., p. 103.

[11] Vgl. Gustave Bardy, Recherches sur Saint Lucien d'Antioche et son École, Paris 1936 (ÉTH), p. 338; angegeben in meinem Buch, p. 130, Anm. 251.

[12] Vgl. Marie-Josèphe Rondeua, Le »Commentaire des Psaumes« de Diodore de Tarse et l'Exégèse Antique du Psaume 109/110, RHR 176 (1969), pp. 5-33, 153-188; 177 (1970), pp. 5-33. Vgl. v. a. pp. 161ff.

[13] Im übrigen vgl. Rondeau, ebenda, die allerdings p. 162 versehentlich behauptet, die Lesart ἐξεγέννησα entspreche dem *textus receptus*.

[14] Erbin Kirche. Die Auslegung von Psalm 5,1 in den Psalmenhomilien des Asterius und in der Alten Kirche, Heidelberg 1990 (AHAW.PH 1990/2).

Peterhouse, *Cambridge* CB2 1RD.

Vigiliae Christianae 45 (1991), 399-416, E. J. Brill, Leiden

REVIEWS

Athenagoras, *Legatio pro Christianis*. Edited by Miroslav Marcovich (Patristische Texte und Studien 31). Berlin-New York, Walter de Gruyter, 1990. xii, 158 pages. DM 118.

Pseudo-Justinus, *Cohortatio ad Graecos*, *De monarchia*, *Oratio ad Graecos*. Edited by Miroslav Marcovich (Patristische Texte und Studien 32). Berlin-New York, Walter de Gruyter, 1990. vii, 161 pages. DM 118.

Fresh from his monumental edition of Hippolytus *Refutatio omnium haeresium* published in 1986 (and reviewed in this journal, 42, 1988, 89-90), Miroslav Marcovich has with indefatigable energy turned his hand to two other important early Christian apologetic authors, Athenagoras and Pseudo-Justin. The volumes are identical twins, following exactly the same method and sharing the same format.

Of the pair the volume of Pseudo-Justiniana is the more valuable. These three treatises had not been edited since Otto's third edition of 1879 (for which the basic work had already been done by 1842 when the first edition appeared). This new edition should thus serve to attract attention to these unduly neglected works. Especially the *Cohortatio* offers a copious amount of fascinating material for the study of early Christian apologetic and its way of handling transmitted Hellenic and Judaeo-Hellenistic sources. It is quite remarkable that, to my knowledge, it has never been translated into a modern language. In a compact introduction Marcovich makes a successful attempt to rehabilitate the author of the *Cohortatio* from the withering judgment of the acerbic Geffcken: 'Certainly our author looks like an epigone when compared to the Pleiad of the great apologists of the second century. But he does not lack originality. It is reflected in a well-conceived and successfully developed design, providing the necessary unity for the entire treatise (p. 5)'. The editor then presents the Greek text (only), accompanied by two apparatuses, the upper giving extensive references to sources, parallels and (occasionally) secondary literature, the lower giving an equally detailed critical apparatus. The division into chapters follows the standard numbering already found in previous editions, but Marcovich has usefully introduced paragraph divisions within the chapters themselves. The same procedure is followed for the two other

treatises. In the introduction to the *Oratio* the author follows Harnack in arguing that the passages on the Logos show the 'unmistakeable influence of Clement of Alexandria (103)'. It is a pity that no mention is made of the noteworthy article of E. R. Goodenough at *HThR* 18 (1925) 185-200, where it is argued that the basic tenor of the work is Hellenistic-Jewish rather than Christian. Undoubtedly, however, at §5 it refers to Gal. 4:12 and 5:20-21. Goodenough's solution that Paul used the *Oratio* rather than the other way around will find few takers. But the less extreme thesis that a Christian author has adapted a Hellenistic-Jewish source for his own purposes is worth considering. Hereafter Marcovich adds his own English translation of the *Umarbeitung* of the work made by a certain Ambrose and still extant in a Syriac version. The edition concludes with an Index locorum (only works referred to by Ps. Justin, not of the entire apparatus), an Index nominum and an extensive Index verborum.

The edition of Athenagoras *Legatio pro Christianis* is less startling, for a full critical edition had been prepared by the great classicist Eduard Schwarz in 1891, and since then there have been partially critical editions by Geffcken (1907), Ubaldi (1920, 1933², 1947³) and Schoedel (1972). The introduction is shorter this time, containing mainly a detailed table of contents of the plea. But the apparatus of sources and parallels is even fuller, absorbing all the material collected by Geffcken and adding copious references of its own. Not seldom it occupies more room than the text itself. The collection of material is unquestionably very useful, but one wonders whether this is the best method to present it. The same triad of indices round off the volume. Marcovich has introduced his own system of sub-division of chapters, which differs from that introduced by Ubaldi and taken over by Schoedel. This was not a good idea; a proliferation of numbering systems does nothing but cause confusion. The other treatise attributed (controversially) to Athenagoras, the *De resurrectione*, is not included.

The core of these two works is the critical text, the constitution of which demands careful evaluation. It is apparent that the editor has a fondness for texts for which the evidence is basically limited to a single manuscript (this was also the case for books IV-X of Hippolytus). Now the texts edited in these two volumes all depend on A, the famous Arethas codex (Parisinus gr. 451) of 914 A.D., which Marcovich has studied and collated three times. In the case of Ps. Justin he points out that none of the previous editors had been able to benefit from Har-

nack's discovery that all other mss. were apographs of A. Moreover he argues that the exemplar of the *Cohortatio* 'had suffered from serious corruptions and lacunae'. The proof lies in a comparison with a dozen excerpts preserved in the the *Contra Julianum* of Cyril (p. 19). I would have liked more attention paid to the methodological issues involved here (see the further remarks on indirect tradition below). If one accepts this position, the editor then has a fairly free hand or serious responsibilities (depending on how one looks at it), for he has 'to walk the tight rope between the tolerability of an *auctor barbarus* and the intolerability of a *librarius stupidus* (Preface)'. In the case of Athenagoras Marcovich justifies his new edition by pointing out that Schwartz too often emended the text and undertaking 'a more careful and meticulous study' of the Arethas codex from which all our mss. evidence is derived.

There can be no doubt that Marcovich has exercised more restraint in these two volumes than in his Hippolytus edition. The number of *scripsi*'s and *addidi*'s in the apparatus is reduced. For example at *Coh.* 3.19-25 he rightly retains three readings of A – Ἡράκλειτος ὁ Μεταπόντιος, πάντων, φυσικήν – which conflict with Ps.Justin's source. In one or two cases I would even wish to show less restraint than he does, e.g. at *Leg.* 16.20, where one can argue for the emendation τῷ ἀπαθεῖ α⟨ἰθ⟩έρι on the basis of the extremely common mss. confusion between ἀήρ and αἰθήρ. In general, however, it must be said that Marcovich continues to go against established editorial practice of recent decades in introducing a very considerable number of emendations and additions to the transmitted text. Every now and then he soundly intuits that there is something wrong, e.g. at *Coh.* 6.19 (κοινοτέραν τὴν ψυχήν; but the solution, κοινὸν ὅρον τῆς ψυχῆς, is far from convincing). But far too often the changes made in the body of the text (and not just suggested in the apparatus) are far from necessary, and in fact merely amount to *improvements* on the text, i.e. the editor is printing what he thinks *should* be the text, rather than what it actually *is*. To give one simple example out of hundreds. At *Coh.* 24.24-27 we read the following words introducing a (doubtless spurious) oracle: οὕτως γὰρ καὶ ὁ περὶ τῶν Χαλδαίων ὑμῖν καὶ Ἑβραίων εἰρημένος σημαίνει χρησμός· πυθομένου γάρ τινος, τίνας πώποτε θεοσεβεῖς ἄνδρας γεγενῆσθαι συνέβη, οὕτως εἰρηκέναι αὐτόν φατε... Adducing a similar passage at §11.12, however, Marcovich alters the second part of the sentence to πυθομένου γάρ τινος ⟨χρηστηρίου τινός⟩, τίνας πώποτε θεοσεβεῖς ἄνδρας γεγενῆσθαι συνέβη, οὕτως εἰρηκέναι αὐτό φατε...

I am not persuaded that the changes are necessary. αὐτόν can easily refer to χρησμός, while the addition of a second τινός makes the style even more awkward (τινος... τινός, τίνας). Cyril paraphrases here, so can offer little help. But the fact that he reads ἐρομένου τε καὶ ἀναμαθεῖν ἐθέλοντες τίνες ἂν ἦσαν ὅτι μάλιστα σοφοὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν, i.e. without an object for the inquiry, does not support the emendation.

One might argue that the damage done by all these interferences to the text is limited, for Marcovich is on the whole very conscientious in recording changes and variants in the text. But not all readers delve into the apparatus, so there is always a danger that unnecessary alterations, especially in a text produced in such a classical manner, may gain a canonical status.

A particularly fascinating question that comes up time and time again in these works is what to do when texts cited or taken over from other authors differ from the direct tradition found elsewhere. John Whittaker has recently put forward the radical view that the indirect tradition of texts should be used with extreme care in the establishment of any text, because it was the practice of ancient authors to introduce deliberate alterations in the texts they cite in order to add a dash of the unexpected (in J. N. Grant (ed.), *Editing Greek and Latin Texts*, New York 1989, 63-95). One may not wish to give full assent to this position, but in my view Marcovich certainly makes far too many changes to the text based on his prior knowledge of the direct tradition. Once again I give a single interesting example. At *Coh.* 23.23 Ps.Justin cites some well-known words from Plato *Laws* 741a4-5: διὰ τοῦτο τοίνυν καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Πλάτων εἰς τοῦτ' ἀφορῶν οὕτω γέγραφεν· "ἀνάγκη⟨ν⟩ δὲ οὐδὲ θεὸν ⟨εἶναι⟩ λέγεσθαι δυνατὸν βιάζεσθαι". As Otto in a note pointed out, the first emendation, originally proposed by Moeller, is mandatory on account of the context (ἀνάγκη being identified here with ὕλη, which according to Plato is outside God's control; note that the formulation in the previous sentence, τῷ γὰρ μὴ πεποιηκότι οὐδεμία ἐξουσία πρὸς τὸ μὴ γεγονός is very likely inspired by Philo *Opif.* 10). It is very easy to see how the mistake could have entered the tradition, the scribe not realizing that it is Plato's (wayward) opinion that is at issue here. The second addition, however, for which we read in the apparatus, *addidi ex Platone*, is entirely unnecessary. It is only through comparison with the direct tradition of Plato that it would occur to anyone to add the word, and there is no reason why the author could not have simply left it out.

As noted above, the apparatuses with cross-references to sources and parallels are very complete and often amount to a kind of commentary

on the text involved. Needless to say additions can still always be made. One unfortunate omission that might be mentioned is the very precise parallel for Ps.Justin's report at *Coh.* 6.10 that Aristotle posits, after the first god, some νοητοὶ θεοί, found in the Anonymous *Vita Pythagorae*, p. 239.3-4 Thesleff. A feature that both the *Cohortatio* and the *Legatio* share is their extensive use of doxographical materials, and particularly the Aëtian tradition investigated by Diels in his *Doxographi Graeci*. Marcovich has very diligently noted all the references in his apparatus, but it is a pity that he fails to distinguish between Aëtius (no longer extant) and the extant epitome of his work made by Ps.Plutarch. This has meant that he can throw no light on the thorny question – too complex to discuss here – of whether Athenagoras and Ps.Justin used the original work or the epitome based on it.

Finally one might question whether the presentation of the assembled material in the classical form of a text with apparatuses is the most suitable for current requirements. Marcovich's introductions are no longer in Latin, but as far as the text is concerned he is a purist. A book is not published in Charlotteville, but at *Carlottaepoli Virginiae* (app. to *Leg.* 8.1). To the reviewer this seems pure affectation. I do not know under what constraints Marcovich produced the texts for the series in which they have appeared, but it seems a great pity that he did not follow recent general practice (even followed today in series such as the *Corpus Medicorum Graecorum*) of including a translation facing the Greek text. Moreover I think the modern reader is better served by a commentary proper than by the bloated *apparatus fontium* that Marcovich presents (extremely valuable though it is). The use of an apparatus to give information on a text is always a hit and miss affair. A commentary will give a more precise account of the relation between a text and its sources and parallels; in the case of an apparatus it is the reader who has to look up all the texts and determine what the relation might be. As for the two volumes themselves, they conform to the high standards set by De Gruyter, with one striking exception. On many pages there are large areas of white space, for which I could find no practical explanation, and which the purchaser – who is paying upwards of 70 Pfennig per page – may fail to appreciate. Also one might ask why it was not possible to combine the two texts into one volume. A less expansive presentation might have resulted in a less expensive single volume of some 300 pages or less.

NL-3762 VA *Soest*, Pelikaanweg 7 D. T. RUNIA

Johannes Georg Deckers, Hans Reinhard Seeliger, Gabriele Mietke (edd.), *Die Katakombe »Santi Marcellino e Pietro«, Repertorium der Malereien*. Einleitende Beiträge von Johannes Georg Deckers, Umberto M. Fasola, Jean Guyon, Walter Nikolaus Schumacher und Hans Reinhard Seeliger = Roma Sotterranea 6. In Verbindung mit dem Institut für Christliche Archäologie und Kunstgeschichte der Universität Freiburg im Breisgau. Città del Vaticano, Pontificio Istituto di Archeologia Cristiana/Münster, Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandeling, 1987. 4°, Textband X, 422 SS.; Tafelband 143 farbige und 161 Schwarzweißabbildungen, Gesamtplan mit 83 Umzeichnungen, Gln.DM.630, L.447.000.

Als dieser Rezensent sich als Student in den frühen sechziger Jahren in Rom aufhielt, da war die ihrer Größe, aber vor allem ihrer reichen Bemalung wegen berühmte Katakombe von Marcellinus und Petrus nur sehr selten zugänglich. Man war sich bei der Pontificia Commissione di Archeologia Sacra offenbar der von Besuchern ausgehenden Gefahr sehr bewußt. Während einer Führung durch die Katakombe, welcher der Rezensent als Student des Pontificio Istituto di Archeologia Cristiana beiwohnte, wies unser Lehrer Prof. E. Josi damals noch auf eine andere Gefahr hin. Plötzlich hielt Josi an und sagte zur mir: »Hier spüre ich einen Zug. Irgendwo in der Katakombe muß es einen Erdrutsch gegeben haben«. Das war anno 1963. Tatsächlich leiden die Katakomben unter kleineren Erdrutschen, die den Wandputz beschädigen. So gibt es denn mehrere Gründe weshalb eine eingehende Bestandaufnahme der Bemalung dieser Katakombe, so wie sie uns im vorliegenden Werke geboten wird zu begrüßen ist.

Das Werk umfaßt zwei Teile. Den Textband eröffnet eine Reihe einleitender Aufsätze, von denen der des Haupt-Autors Johannes Deckers ('Einleitende Bemerkungen zur Dokumentation der Malereien in der Katakombe Ss. Marcellino e Pietro', S. 3-42) und der Jean Guyons ('La topographie et la chronologie du cimetière »inter duos lauros«', S. 91-131) besonders hervorzuheben sind. Inwiefern diese Autoren in Fragen z.B. der Datierung der Malereien einer Meinung sind, wird der Rez. später erörtern. Andere Beiträge stammen aus den berufenen Federn von U. Fasola, W.N. Schumacher und H.R. Seeliger. J. Deckers hat die Beschreibungen der etwa 90 bemalten Grabkammern verfaßt (S. 198-356). Hier werden systematisch aufgeführt: die Nummer der Grabkammer (welche jeweils mit der in A. Nestori, *Repertorio topografico delle*

pitture delle catacombe romane, Vatikanstadt, 1975, genannten korrespondiert), die Namen der Grabkammern mit den früher verwendeten Grabkammernummern oder Abkürzungen; dann folgen Hinweise zu den Abbildungen, Angaben zur Lokalisierung innerhalb der Katakombe, Mitteilungen zur Lage und Gestalt, zur Geschichte, zum heutigen Erhaltungszustand und zu den Farben. Das 'pièce de résistance' bildet selbstverständlich jeweils die Beschreibung der Wandmalereien, wobei immer die Abfolge: Front -O-, Decke -1-, Haupt- oder Rückwand -2-, linke Wand -3-, rechte Wand -4- und Eingangswand -5- eingehalten wird. Diese Abfolge stimmt mit der Präsentation der Umzeichnungen der photogrammetrischen Aufnahmen überein, die als lose Blätter in einer Kaßette beiliegen. Jede Beschreibung wird mit einschlägigen Hinweisen auf die Inschriften und die Datierung (mit ausführlicher Erwähnung früherer Datierungsversuche) und einer Bibliographie abgeschlossen. Am Ende des Textbandes findet der Leser Indices, Konkordanzen, eine illustrierte Liste ornamentaler Motive, einen Glossar, eine Reihe der antiken und neuzeitlichen Bei- und Aufschriften, eine Aufzählung der antiken und mittelalterlichen Autoren sowie, schließlich, 22 Seiten Literaturverzeichnis. Ein Werk der Gründlichkeit!

Die Abbildungen stellen daneben eine nicht unbedeutendere Leistung dar. Der Tafelband (Band 2) umfaßt 35 Reproduktionen aus dem immer noch unentbehrlichen Standardwerk Antonio Bosios (*Roma Sotterranea*, Rom, 1632) und 126 Photographien, die J. Deckers in den Jahren 1981 und 1982 angefertigt hat. Nur hier muß der Leser blättern, aber hieraus darf man den Autoren keinen Vorwurf machen; denn, wenn man Schwarz-Weiß- und Farb-Abbildungen nicht getrennt hätte, dann wären die Kosten unverhältnismäßig gewachsen. Ein Nachteil ist freilich, daß die Photographien meistens nur die Details der Bemalung einer Grabkammer wiedergeben. Hatte A. Bosio mit seinen bescheidenen Mitteln schon versucht diesen Nachteil zu vermeiden, Joseph Wilpert (*Die Malereien der Katakomben Roms*, 2 Bde, Freiburg/Br., 1903), Enrico Josis älterer Kollege, meinte sich noch mit der Wiedergabe von — wenn auch meisterhaft gelungenen — Detailaufnahmen begnügen zu können. Da war ein F. Hendrichs (*Het Christelijk Getuigenis der Catacomben*, Herzogenbusch, 1926) mit seinen Schwarz-Weiss-Abbildungen viel großzügiger.Jetzt hat aber das von J.G. Deckers geführte deutsche Unternehmen einen Sprung vorwärts gemacht, indem es (innerhalb von nur 2 Wochen!) alle Malereien dieser Katakombe photogrammetrisch hat aufnehmen lassen. Obschon die zeichnerische Auswertung dieser

Aufnahmen Probleme bereitet hat, darf das Resultat als gelungen gelten, da man in einem Blick die gesammte Bemalung einer Grabkammer vor Augen hat. Namentlich bei einer sehr reich bemalten Kammer wie z.B. Nr. 65 ist es ein Genuß, bei der Lektüre der mehr als 6 Seiten Beschreibung (S. 312-318) eine große 'Umzeichnung' von 67,5 × 45 Zm. bei der Hand zu haben, welche die Lokalisierung sämtlicher Photographien (im Falle der Kammer 65: vier Schwarz-Weiss- und acht Farb-Aufnahmen) erleichtert. Damit wäre aber noch nicht alles gesagt. Denn die Beschreibung erwähnt Details, oft ornamentaler Art, welche wir nur in der Umzeichnung, nicht aber auf den Photographien finden können. Keine Farbphotographie könnte nämlich alle Details der oft flüchtig ausgeführten Malereien wiedergeben, »die sich trotz schlechter Erhaltung, Schmutz und Sinter erst bei wechselnder Beleuchtung dem prüfenden Auge des Archäologen zeigen. Keine Beschreibung kann die Genauigkeit und Informationsdichte einer den Befund kritisch selektionierenden Umzeichnung erreichen« (J.G. Deckers auf S. 41). Der Rez. kan dies aufgrund seiner eigenen, in Ägypten gemachten Erfahrungen nur bestätigen.

Der Reiz einer derartigen Bestandaufnahme zeigt sich eben im Falle eines komplexen Dekorationsschemas, so wie wir das in der Grabkammer 65 vor uns haben. Text- und Tafelband behandeln nicht nur Gliederung und Ornamentik, sondern beleuchten auch den theologischen und ikonographischen Hintergrund. Bei der Benennung der figürlichen Motive geht der Verf. behutsam vor: der 'gute' Hirt ist einfach zum 'Hirten' geworden und das Quellwunder wird nicht mehr dem Moses oder dem Petrus zugeschrieben. Problematisch bleibt aber hier, wie anderswo, die Frage der Datierung. Der Archäologe Deckers gibt für die Bemalung der Grabkammer 65, wie überhaupt für die Mehrzahl der Grüfte in dieser Katakombe, die Periode 320-340 als Entstehungszeit an. Der große Kenner der Topographie dieser Katakombe, Jean Guyon, ist dagegen der Meinung, daß gerade dieser reich bemalte Teil des Zömeteriums noch aus der letzten Hälfte des vorgehenden Jahrhunderts stammen würde, was einen erheblichen Unterschied bedeutet. Bei der Präsentation dieses Werkes am 15. Dezember 1987 in Rom wurde Guyon nach den Gründen gefragt, warum in dieser Katakombe nach 321 kaum Bestattungen vorgenommen wurden. Seiner Meinung nach liesse sich der Wandel vielleicht damit erklären, daß für die Reichen eine überirdische Bestattung in diesem Gebiete deswegen attraktiver geworden wäre, weil Konstantin dort eine den Heiligen Marcellinus und

Petrus geweihte Basilika hatte bauen lassen. Nicht nur Helena, auch andere Christen, wurden in den um diese neue Kirche situierten Mausoleen bestattet. In diesen Mausoleen habe Guyon bisher aber noch keine andere Dekoration feststellen können als eine in Marmor ausgeführte (siehe Ph.Pergola, 'Seminari di Archeologia Cristiana', *Rivista di Archeologia Cristiana* 64 (1988), S. 329).

Der Rez. erlaubt sich von einer Teilnahme an dieser Diskussion abzusehen und das schon deswegen, weil die Chronologie im Aufbau des vorliegenden Werkes nur eine untergeordnete Rolle spielt. Die hier vorgelegte schöne Publikation wird aber sicherlich zur Lösung dieser Frage beitragen können. Denn nie zuvor war uns eine solche Einsicht in der Bemalung des Zömeteriums »inter duos lauros« geboten worden. Anders gesagt: Über keine Katakombe in Rom sind wir derzeit so gut informiert worden, wie über *Ss. Marcellino e Pietro*. Den unermüdlichen Autoren, insbesondere ihrem Leiter Professor Deckers und dem Verleger möchte der Rez. seine Bewunderung aussprechen.

2401 AH *Alphen aan den Rijn,* PAUL VAN MOORSEL
Groenoord 136 Niederlande.

The Studia Philonica Annual. Studies in Hellenistic Judaism. Vol. I (1989) and II (1990). Edited by David T. Runia (Brown Judaic Studies 185 and 226). Scholars Press, Atlanta. 175 pp., 245 pp.

Philonic studies are flourishing at the present time. They are of interest not only to lovers of Philo, but also to scholars in related fields of research: early Judaism, early Christianity, ancient philosophy, ancient history, Gnosticism, and so on. The Annual under review is the continuation of an initiative started in 1972, which resulted in six issues of *Studia Philonica* (1972-1980).

The Annual consists of three sections: 1. a series of articles on Philo and the world of early Judaism; 2. a bibliography of all recent publications on the subject; 3. a book review section. Through these three sections it surveys the whole field of Philonic studies, and thus may rightly be characterized as *a companion to the study of Philo and his world.*

The editor is David T. Runia, who is well-known for his thesis Philo of Alexandria and the *Timaeus* of Plato (Amsterdam 1983, Leiden 1982²) and his many articles (a number of which have been published

in this journal) on the 'Exegesis and Philosophy' of Philo, now collected together in a Variorum Reprints volume (London 1990). He is assisted by David M. Hay and David Winston, both of whom are experts in the field.

Annual I (1989) attempts to cover the years 1981 to 1986. Burton L. Mack commences with a brief introduction which connects the new Annual with its predecessor *Studia Philonica*, of which he was an editor: 'The Studia Philonica Annual: an Uncommon Phoenix'. Then J. Riaud gives an In memoriam for Valentin Nikiprowetzky, the great French Philonic scholar who passed away in December 1983. The Annual then publishes a posthumous article by Nikiprowetzky: 'Thèmes et traditions de la lumière chez Philon d'Alexandrie'. The remaining articles in the volume are:

> J. Laporte, 'Sacrifice and Forgiveness in Philo of Alexandria'; H. D. Weiss, 'A Schema of "the Road" in Philo and Lucan'; S. McKnight, '*De Vita Mosis* 1.147: Lion Proselytes in Philo'; D. R. Schwartz, 'Philonic Anonyms of the Roman and Nazi Periods: Two Suggestions'; D. T. Runia, 'Some Statistical Observations on Fifty Years of Philonic Scholarship'; D. T. Runia, 'An *Index locorum Philonicorum* to Völker.'

In the bibliographical section D. T. Runia, R. Radice and D. Satran give a bibliography of Philonic studies for the years 1981-1986. This is a shortened version of the relevant parts of their monumental *Philo of Alexandria: an Annotated Bibliography 1937-1986* (Leiden 1988). In order to keep the length within bounds the annotations are this time not included. In the third section reviews are presented of seven books connected with Philonic and related studies (reviewers Hay, Royse, Runia, Winston).

Annual II (1990) is longer than its predecessor. In its article section it presents the following five articles:

> D. Winston, 'Judaism and Hellenism: Hidden Tensions in Philo's Thought'; M. B. Dick, 'The Ethics of the Old Greek Book of Proverbs'; W. E. Helleman, 'Philo of Alexandria on Deification and Assimilation to God'; N. G. Cohen, 'Agrippa I and *De specialibus legibus* IV 151-159'; P. L. Shuler, 'Philo's Moses and Matthew's Jesus: A Comparative Study in Ancient Literature'.

The bibliography section this time contains an *annotated* bibliography for the years 1986-1987. It is by the same three authors who produced the larger bibliography mentioned above, and can be considered a con-

tinuation of that work. In an appendix a provisional bibliography is given for the years 1988-1989 (only names and titles, no annotation).

In the review section fourteen books are examined, the reviewers this time being Borgen, Dillon, Goulet, Hay, Méasson, Rosenstock, Runia, Sandelin, Satran, Siegert, Zeller.

In this second volume a fourth section is initiated, called Instrumenta. The editors 'think of tools such as indices, concordances, list of authors and writings, and so on.' In an extensive article entitled 'How to search Philo' Runia gives a survey of possible ways to search the vast corpus of Philo's writings. 2 of these use conventional methods (i.e. indices or lexica), while 3 make use of computer-assisted methods. The latter methods have the advantage of being user-interactive, i.e. they are better able to respond to the precise question that the research poses, but have two considerable disadvantages, namely that a greater financial investment is required, and that developments in hardware and software go so fast that equipment soon becomes out of date.

It only remains for us to congratulate the editors with the publication of these highly instructive volumes, and to express the hope that the Annual will continue to serve as a useful companion for all scholars working on Philo and related areas.

2312 GD *Leiden*, Haarlemmerstraat 106B J.C.M. VAN WINDEN

Tertulliano, *Scorpiace*. A cura di Giovanna Azzali Bernardelli (Biblioteca Patristica). Nardini Editore, Centro Internazionale del Libro, Firenze, 1991. L. 34000.

In the treatise entitled *Scorpiace* Tertullian opposes the Gnostics, and particularly the Valentinians, because of their attitude towards martyrdom. In a time of persecution—the work was written in about 212, during the persecution of Scapula—they defended the thesis that this kind of confession was not obligatory. Such a view could not fail to rouse a fiery person like Tertullian to indignation, especially as he was by this time well aware of the dangers it posed for weak-minded Christians.

In Tertullian's view the behaviour of these heretics during the heat of the persecution can be compared with the activity of scorpions in the heat of summer. For this reason he gave his treatise the title *Scorpiace*,

which is the Latin transcription of the Greek σκορπιακή (ἀντίδοσις), i.e. an antidote against the poisonous bite of a scorpion. It is thus a special kind of θηριακὴ ἀντίδοσις, which is the general name for an antidote against a poisonous bite. In Scorp. 1,12 Tertullian used the Latin form of the latter term, where he writes: *Itaque tempus admonuit adversus nostrates bestiolas ... theriacam stilo temperare*, to which he adds in his pointed manner, *Qui legeris, biberis*. Tertullian prepares an antidote with his pen, and offers it to the reader to drink.

The text is preceded by an introduction, in which date, intention and structure of the treatise are dealt with. The author also pays attention to the history of the text, which has been handed down via the Agobardinus and the editio princeps of 1545. The latter was based on a very ancient manuscript (see below). With regard to the authorship of the first edition the author takes a surprising position. She ascribes it to Joannes Gangnaeus (J. de Ganay), whose name is on the reverse of the title page (more on this below). This was the common opinion until 1906, when E. Kroymann in CSEL vol. XLVII, p. XII, because of an acrostich on the same page, came to the conclusion that Martinus Mesnart must be considered to have been its author.

Because this early edition is not easily accessible to the reader, it will perhaps be useful to sketch the situation here. On the reverse of the title page one reads; *Catalogus operum Q. Septimii Florentis Tertulliani, quae primum diligentia B. Rhenani in lucem edita sunt*. There follows a series of 22 titles. The text then continues: *Haec vero sequentia opuscula nunc primum eduntur in lucem beneficio Ioannis Gangneii Parisini theologi, et Christianissimi Galliarum regis primi eleemosynarii, ex vetustissimo codice desumpta.* At this point a series of 11 titles is given, among which *Adversus Gnosticos Scopiacum* (sic). Finally one reads: *Ad lectorem iambicum primis versuum elementis authoris nomen prae se gerens*. The acrostich that follows shows the name MARTINUS MESNART. The situation seems to be quite clear. The iambic poem, which serves as an *Ad lectorem*, shows the name of the editor, Martinus Mesnart, who was able to carry out this task, at least with regard to the second series of treatises, *beneficio Ioannis Gangneii*. The kind of *beneficium* meant is not indicated, but one must suppose that de Ganay supplied the money for procuring the manuscript or publishing the edition or both.

The present editor has to assume that the iambic poem does not reveal the author of the edition, but rather the author of the poem only. The

poem would then have been composed to celebrate the rediscovery of the second series of works of Tertullian (cf. p. 49). She is also constrained to assume that de Ganay describes his own edition as a *beneficium*, in the sense of something that has been *bene* or *egregie factum*. (Another treatment of the question is found in the third chapter of her *Quaestiones Tertullianeae criticae*, Mantova 1990, entitled "I codici e il metodo editoriale de J. de Ganay e di S. Gelen".)

In my view this interpretation is unacceptable. The author herself puts forward the suggestion (p. 50, n. 97) that perhaps J. de Ganay took upon himself the patronage of the edition and supplied the manuscripts. This seems to me the only viable possibility.

It should be emphasized, however, that this misguided attribution does not affect the constitution of the text or its translation. The last critical edition was produced by Reifferscheid-Wissowa in CSEL (1890). The editor of the *Corpus Christianorum* edition (CCL 2, 1954) simply took over the text and apparatus of CSEL, except that he added a second apparatus in which conjectures made by a number of scholars in the intervening years were cited.

The present edition is based on all these materials and on more than thirty years of thorough research. The first article of the editor on the *Scorpiace* dates back to 1960. All this labour has resulted in a fine edition of this treatise, which is above all interesting for the impressive way in which Tertullian displays his vehement eloquence.

Some small remarks. In *Scorp.* 1,5, after saying that during the persecution the heretics resemble scorpions in the summer, Tertullian goes on to explain: *Nam quod sciunt multos simplices ac rudes tum infirmos, plerosque vero in ventum et si placuerit Christianos, numquam magis adeundos sapiunt...* The editor puts, in contrast with Reiff.-Wiss., a comma after *rudes* and translates: "Poiché sanno que molti cristiani sono semplici, impreparati, deboli e molto sono bandervole al vento dell'opportunismo..." Clearly she interprets *infirmos* on a level with *simplices ac rudes*, giving all three a predicative meaning (*tum* is understood as equivalent of *et*). In my view Tertullian says: "Because they know that many simple and ignorant Christians are weak at that time (i.e. of persecution) etc.". The words *multos simplices ac rudes* are subject of the accusative and infinitive, *infirmos* is predicative, while *tum* is an adverb of time. (For *in ventum* one could refer to Eccles. 5,15.)

In *Scorp.* 6,1 the comma before *per virtutem* should be removed, and

one wonders why *virtus* is not rendered by "virtù" rather than by "valore". In 12,8 the comma before *dei* is mistaken.

As always Tertullian's Latin is recalcitrant. It is a great merit of this edition that the author, by means of her translation and annotations, has made such a difficult text accessible to the modern reader.

2312 GD *Leiden*, Haarlemmerstraat 106B J. C. M. VAN WINDEN

P. Pilhofer, *Presbyteron Kreitton. Der Altersbeweis der jüdischen und christlichen Apologeten und seine Vorgeschichte* (Wiss. Unters. zum N.T. 2.Reihe 39). Tübingen, J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1990.

Der Altersbeweis, d.h. der Nachweis, dass eine Sache alt ist, bekommt dann eine besondere Bedeutung, wenn diesem Alt-sein eine bestimmte Wertung beigelegt wird. In der frühchristlichen und jüdischen Apologetik spielt der Altersbeweis eine wichtige Rolle. Verschiedene christliche Apologeten versuchen zu beweisen, dass das Christentum, das scheinbar eine junge Religion ist, tatsächlich sehr alt ist. Dieser Versuch erklärt sich aus der Tatsache, dass man in einer Umgebung lebte, die auf dem Alt-sein hohen Wert beilegte. Es ist die erste Absicht des Verf. diese Tatsache herauszustellen.

»Was älter ist, ist besser«. Diese Aussage des Timaios von Lokri, die der Verf. als Titel für seine Abhandlung gewählt hat, deutet sehr wohl dieses Gefühl, diese Überzeugung, an. Es wird gezeigt, wie diese Überzeugung schon sehr früh im griechischen Bereich, und später auch im römischen nachweisbar ist. Die ersten Spuren findet der Verf. in Hekataios von Milet, eine weitere Ausarbeitung bei Herodot, Aristophanes und Plato. Interessant ist auf lateinischem Gebeit die Haltung des hominis novi, Cicero.

Der Altersbeweis wirkt sich in den verschiedenen Lebensgebieten verschieden aus. Im Bereich des Denkens kann der Wert des Alt-seins nur in der Wahrheit liegen. Was alt ist, ist wahr. Frühchristliche Apologeten wie Justin, Tatian, Theophilus und Tertullian versuchen zu zeigen, dass die christliche Philosophie eine alte Weisheit enthält und deshalb Anspruch auf Wahrheit erheben kann.

Der Verfasser hat diesen Gedankenkomplex ausgearbeitet, wobei auch der jüdische Komponent nicht vergessen wird (Aristoboulos, Flavius Josephus, Philo). Bezüglich Justin's Auffassung hätte er noch auf

Dial. 2,1 weisen können, wo gesagt wird, dass die Philosophie eine einzige Wissenschaft ist, die zu den Menschen niedergesandt worden ist (offensichtlich von Gott und in sehr früher Zeit). Das Christentum wäre die Fortsetzung dieser einen alten Philosophie.

Im Schlusskapitel legt der Verf. dar, dass aus theologischen Gründen dieser Altersbeweis zu kritisieren ist. Das Christentum bringt etwas wesentlich Neues und dies wird mit dem Altersbeweis verdunkelt, meint der Verf. Justin würde diese Auffassung m.E. bestreiten und sagen: die Erscheinung des Logos in Christus ist tatsächlich etwas Neues, aber derselbe Logos war der Ursprung alles Wahren in der Zeit vor seiner Erscheinung. In diesem Sinn ist die Wahrheit des Christentums alt.

Der Verf. hat sich auf die Apologeten des 2.Jahrhunderts beschränkt. Er weiss, wie der Altersbeweis in der Apologetik des 3. und 4. Jahrhunderts (Origenes versus Kelsos, und Eusebius) äusserst wichtig gewesen ist. Es ist sein Verdienst, dass er die frühe Geschichte dieses Gedankens klar untersucht hat.

2312 GD *Leiden*, Haarlemmerstraat 106B J.C.M. VAN WINDEN

Giuseppe Visonà, *Pseudo Ippolito in sanctum Pascha.* Studio edizione commento (Studia Patristica Mediolanensia 15). Vita e Pensiero. Pubblicazioni della Università del Sacro Cuore. Milano, 1988. 548 p. L. 80.000.

L'homélie *In sanctum Pascha* a été transmise parmi les écrits pseudo-chrysostomiens, dans une collection de sept homélies pascales. En 1926, Ch. Martin signala que le texte de deux fragments que d'anciens florilèges avaient attribués à une œuvre d'Hippolyte se trouvait dans *In sanctum Pascha*. Peu de temps après, A. Ehrhard découvrit dans quelques feuilles palimpsestes d'un ancien homéliaire de l'abbaye de Grottaferrata environ un tiers de notre homélie sous le titre: «d'Hippolyte évêque de Rome et martyr sur la sainte Pâque.» Martin, qui considérait Hippolyte comme l'auteur, réussit à découvrir des traces nombreuses de *In sanctum Pascha* dans une homélie pascale de Proclus de Constantinople. Mais l'attribution à Hippolyte se révéla fausse quand, en 1945, R. Conolly eut prouvé que le style rhétorique et baroque de *In sanctum Pascha* cadre mal avec celui d'Hippolyte. Puis P. Nautin, dans son édi-

tion critique de 1957, accepta cette conclusion; selon lui, l'homélie anonyme était le travail d'un homéliste tardif que se serait inspiré du traité sur la Pâque d'Hippolyte. Dix ans plus tard cependant, Cantalamessa, dans une étude détaillée, arriva à la conclusion qu'il faudrait plutôt penser au milieu asiatique de Méliton de Sardes, représentant la tradition quartodécimane.

Bien que cette thèse, en général, fût accueillie favorablement, G. Visonà estimait que le dernier mot n'avait pas encore été dit. Tout en reconnaissant la valeur indéniable des recherches de Cantalamessa, Visonà part d'une autre optique: il y a le fait que beaucoup de données et de motifs de *In sanctum Pascha* sont loin d'être restreints au deuxième siècle et, pour cette raison, ne pourraient tout simplement être accepté comme la preuve de la thèse selon laquelle il faut situer cette homélie à l'époque en question.

Tandis que Cantalamessa voit dans l'emploi de la terminologie des mystères dans *In sanctum Pascha* une opposition délibérée aux cultes païens qui, au deuxième siècle, avaient une grande diffusion en Asie Mineure, Visonà, de son côté, constate qu'une telle terminologie est employée non moins abondamment dans des écrits chrétiens du 4e siècle et reproche pour cela à Cantalamessa que son argumentation sur ce point est trop faible, sans toutefois en venir lui-même à proposer une datation plus tardive (p. 177-181). En évitant tout préjugé, il se demande cependant si, avec une telle datation, la question des néologismes dans *In sanctum Pascha* ne deviendrait pas plus simple. Visonà relève également que les éléments rhétoriques qui se trouvent dans cet écrit ont des parallèles remarquables aux 4e et 5e siècles. On sait qu'en partant du vocabulaire et du style, plusieurs savants ont préféré attribuer à cette homélie une date plus tardive (Richard: début du 3e siècle; Reyners: période de Constantin; Mohrmann: debut du 5e siècle).

D'autre part Visonà établit que les données relatives à l'usage que *In sanctum Pascha* fait de l'Écriture contiennent des éléments qui plaident en faveur de l'ancienneté de l'homélie, en particulier les liens avec la tradition des *testimonia* qu'on peut réconstruire à travers les témoignages de Justin, Irénée, Tertullien et Cyprien (p. 103). Puis, sous plusieurs aspects, l'homélie est plus proche des idées théologiques d'Irénée que de celles des théologiens du 4e siècle (p. 148).

Notons ici que dans un passage de Ps. Epiphanius (p. 167, ligne 5), comparé du point de vue stylistique, il faut lire τοῦ κράτους au lieu de τοὺς κράτους.

L'étude introductive et le commentaire contiennent une documentation très riche et dense servant à mieux encadrer le texte, qui lui-même a été légèrement amélioré en comparaison de celui de Nautin. C'est que Visonà a examiné de nouveau la tradition manuscrite, ce qui l'a amené à assigner à deux mss. une autre place dans le *stemma*, à faire usage de deux *codices* non utilisés par Nautin et à émender le texte au moyen de quelques conjectures de son cru.

6523 LH *Nijmegen*, Postweg 152 G. J. M. BARTELINK

M. Girardi, *Basilio di Cesarea e il culto dei martiri nel IV secolo. Scrittura e tradizione* (Quaderni di "Vetera Christianorum" 21). Bari, Istituto di Studi classici e cristiani, 1990. 317 p.

In B. Gain's large survey of Christian life in 4th century Cappadocia, as this has been described and commented upon in Basil's Letters, (OCA 225, Rome 1985) pages 215-225 have been allotted to the cult of the martyrs. Now the author had to deal with many subjects and according to the title of his book (*L'église de Cappadoce au IVe siècle d'après la correspondance de Basile de Césarée*) his primary material was in principle derived from the letters of the bishop of Caesarea. Nevertheless the importance of the martyrs for everyday life and for the ecclesiastical liturgy could have received a little more attention. The matter is even worthy of treatment in a special monograph, as has been made clear by the book under review. Its author is an Italian scholar whose publications about Basil and related matters testify to his expertise in this field.

Girardi deals with three aspects of the subject. First he describes Basil's terminology, the "lessico della testimonianza" (11-75). This title of the first part of the book announces a thorough survey of the use of μάρτυς and its cognates, both nouns and verbs. Martyrological terminology is of course not confined to these words, but G.'s aim is to bring out the "testimonial" meanings and connotations. This draws the attention to the remarkable fact that in Christian texts μάρτυς apart from its frequent occurrences as an official title also remains in use with its traditional meanings (e.g. *ep.* 88: τῆς πενίας ἡμῶν...μάρτυρα), even in a fully Christian context (cf. *Spir.* 13.29 about the angels: πιστοὶ μάρτυρες τῆς ἀληθείας). The author's main objective is to show the scriptural

background of many such passages in Basil, whose general way of thinking is "di un rigore e consequenzialità scritturistici come pochi altri" (63). Although part of the material exposed seems to be somewhat superfluous, G.'s elucidation is quite useful.

In the second part (79-144) G. scrutinizes four encomia of martyrs from his particular point of view, which is clearly expressed in the title ("I fondamenti biblici del panegirico per i martiri"). As he explains in note 1 on p. 79, G. had to restrict himself to the four encomia the Greek version of which has been preserved (and printed in PG 31). In his paraphrases he keeps hammering away at the need to recognize the "trama scritturistica" (115), which should not get lost beneath the traditional rhetorical patterns. In fact it is this biblical weft which transforms "persone e fatti, reali o meno, in segni e simboli di realtà spirituali" (125).

The third part of the book (147-218) is devoted to the honour conferred on the martyrs and the cult of the saints. There is a remarkably explicit statement in the *Homily on Psalm 115*: ὁ ἁψάμενος ὀστέων μάρτυρος λαμβάνει τινὰ μετουσίαν ἁγιασμοῦ ἐκ τῆς τῷ σώματι παρεδρευούσης χάριτος (*hom. in Ps. CXV* 4, PG 30, 112C). Unfortunately the authenticity of this sermon is not a certainty and thus CPG 2910 lists it among the "dubia". G., however, is confident that i.a. Gribomont's arguments have put an end to all doubts. This point is of course quite important, for it would show that Basil's great "pietà per le reliquie dei martiri" (173) was also firmly based on the interpretation of a famous biblical text, viz. "Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints". There are more interesting aspects of this specific subject, such as the great enthusiasm of popular devotion and Basil's episcopal responsibility to keep festivities within acceptable bounds. In the West bishops had to cope with similar problems: *calices ad sepulcra martyrum deferunt atque illic in vesperam bibunt* (Ambr. *Hel.* 17.62). G. also has a chapter on Basil's grappling with the problems posed by the Arian "persecutions". Could the victims of these have a right to an honorific title like the "normal" martyrs?

This book does not contain surprising new views or spectacular hypotheses. Essentially it provides a wealth of well-ordered material, which is made easily accessible by the fine indices (263-310). For this reason it should be consulted by those who are interested in Basil's life and thought or in martyrological studies.

2353 BM *Leiderdorp*, van Effendreef 15 J. DEN BOEFT